

CHAPTER 30

LITERACY

GREG WOOLF

I. THE EXTENT AND SIGNIFICANCE OF LITERACY¹

Literacy poses in an acute form a central problem of Roman cultural history. How are we to reconcile the striking contrasts between the Roman world and our own, with the equally striking similarities? Very few of the inhabitants of the Roman empire were able to read even the simplest documents, fewer still could write as much as their own name. In that respect, Roman antiquity conforms to our expectations about the world in general before mass education, the printing press, the industrial revolution and all the other paraphernalia of modern, western civilization. Yet, superficially at least, Romans seem to have used writing in ways that are immediately familiar to us: to write poems and contracts, love-letters and sales invoices, public notices and graffiti, to register births, to tax the living and to commemorate the dead. Literacy offers one way of exploring this culture as a whole. But the strength of literacy as a vehicle for this exploration, the apparent pervasiveness of the written word, also creates problems. Roman literacy cannot be closely circumscribed as an area of study, and there is no single issue to be resolved. Instead, the study of Roman writing practices sheds new light on many aspects of early imperial society, economy, religion and government, and suggests new connections between them. Writing was not so much a single phenomenon as an aspect of Roman cultural style, and the apparent contradiction between the banal everyday uses of the written word and its evident symbolic significance suggests new ways of looking at modern, as well as ancient, literacies.

The centrality of writing in Roman imperial civilization would have been apparent to any visitor to a Roman town.² Milestones marked the approaches to the town and then, just before entering the city limits, the

¹ Harris, *Ancient Literacy*, is the only full length study. Humphrey (1991) brings together a series of essays written in response to Harris' work. For Greek literacy Thomas (1989), and especially Detienne (1988) and Thomas (1992), both with critical bibliographies, provide good introductions to a much larger body of scholarship. McKitterick (1989) and (1990) discuss the issue in an early mediaeval context. Bowman and Woolf (1994) collects essays relating to the connection between literacy and power in a number of ancient societies.

² Harris (1983) and Franklin (1991) on Pompeii, Corbier (1987) on Rome.

roads would begin to be lined by cemeteries. Some tombs were huge monuments with long inscriptions, but even the more modest tombstones were carved with simple epitaphs. On entering the town, the visitor was exposed to further displays of writing. The walls of the houses that lined the streets of Pompeii were covered in notices, elegant painted proclamations in support of electoral candidates for the chief magistracies of the town or the programmes for forthcoming games, detailing the animals that would appear, the number of gladiators and, most prominently, the names of those whom the public had to thank. Around the forum and in particular in the vicinity of temples were inscriptions on the bases of statues of local grandees, bronze laws, building dedications and sometimes imperial edicts. Temples also attracted perishable notices, recording vows made and fulfilled or accompanying offerings and religious calendars, painted or inscribed, listing market days, the dates of festivals and games, and also the days on which business transactions were taboo. Less reverent were the graffiti, obscene, literary, personal, humorous, that were scratched on walls throughout the town. Monumental inscriptions comprised only a fraction of the writing visible in the urban setting. Wax writing tablets recording business transactions have been found in the Vesuvian cities and elsewhere recording sales and loans, affidavits, labour contracts and the formation and dissolution of partnerships. Bookshops existed too, selling literary works on papyrus, at least in Rome and the major cities of the East, while one bookseller is known from the Egyptian village of Karanis.³ Pliny notes with surprise that his works can be bought in Lyons,⁴ but lines of Virgil are known from graffiti in Britain and thousands of literary papyri have been recovered from the sands of Roman Egypt.⁵ A villa outside Pompeii contained a papyrus library, a private collection showing an interest in Hellenistic philosophy, and public libraries also existed in some towns, many of them the result of aristocratic munificence, like the one built at Comum by Pliny the Younger. More significant for the contact that most town-dwellers had with writing were the stone-cutters, who carved epitaphs on tombstones, and the professional scribes, who drew up contracts and wrote letters, even for those who could sign them themselves. Most mundane and familiar of all the uses of writing were, perhaps, the painted labels on amphorae describing their contents, the stamps impressed in the bases of ceramic tableware and the legends on coins.

Beyond the town and its surrounding cemeteries, writing was far less evident. Roman Britain illustrates the possible limits of literacy in the provinces. Most of the graffiti scratched on pottery derives either from military sites or from towns, just as most of the names written on tiles and bricks

³ Kleberg (1975), Kenney (1982). For Karanis *PPetous* 30.

⁴ *Ep.* IX.11.

⁵ Pack (1965).

before they were fired are Roman names, most of them probably soldiers. Inscriptions on stone are almost entirely limited to the frontiers and other areas where soldiers were common.⁶ Writing played a number of important roles in the life and working of the Roman army in Britain, yet it seems hardly to have penetrated the countryside, except in the form of milestones and at rural sanctuaries like Uley. The extent of this contrast must have varied from province to province, as did the scale of urbanization. Probably less than 5 per cent of the population of the north-west provinces lived in towns, while recent estimates of the urban population of Egypt and Campania have been as high as 30 per cent. Where writing was used in the countryside, whether on votive offerings at the temple of Clitumnus described by Pliny, or as tally lists for the pottery kilns of La Graufesenque in southern France, or simply as milestones along the Roman roads, it was the product of the power of the classical city and of the Roman empire over the rural hinterland. No separate rural writing practices can be attested for the early Roman empire and writing always remained a component of either the urban or the military versions of Roman civilization. Most inhabitants of the empire only had personal experience of writing when they visited the town.

It is easy to miss the dynamic nature of that culture. Towns appear to us as panoramas, frozen, like Pompeii, in a single moment of time. But writing must have been perceived more as an activity than as an artefact by the inhabitants of ancient cities. Bright new election notices superseded last year's faded proclamations, new edicts were displayed on *alba*, wooden boards painted white, new statues took their places among older weathered images, accompanied by new inscriptions, and new legends appeared at intervals on coins. Writing impinged on the spectator even more forcefully on occasion. When the wealthy processed through the city streets on their way to sacrifice, placards were carried detailing the name of the celebrant, the god who was to receive the offering and the reasons for it.⁷ Similar signs were carried in triumphs in Rome, proclaiming the origins of captives and the names of far-away countries subjected to Roman arms. When *damnatio memoriae* was pronounced on an emperor, city magistrates throughout the empire hurried to chip his name off monuments, just as they cut his face off statues. Some emperors burned records of tax arrears publicly, but others burned literature that was thought subversive, whether histories or books of sorcery, or, like Caligula, deliberately posted up new taxes where they could not be seen. The written word was only one component of a range of symbols and images manipulated in this way. But every member of Roman society must have been conscious of the power of writing to signal and generate change even if, like us, they were quickly inured to the

⁶ Evans (1987), Tomlin (1979), Biró (1975).

⁷ Veyne (1983).

inscriptions on old buildings. But even the meaning of ancient inscriptions remained latent, ready to be evoked in a new context, as when Caesar's opponents daubed graffiti on the statue of the first Brutus, inciting the Brutus of the day to overthrow the new monarchy.

But it is not enough to inject movement into our picture of the ancient city: it is also necessary to add a soundtrack. The visual panorama was supplemented with a whole range of utterances that are now lost to us, as the Roman world survives for us only as a series of silent texts supplemented by a few visual images. The fora must have been noisy with stallholders calling out their wares, sacrifices were accompanied by music and triumphs by songs, while official announcements were proclaimed by heralds as well as posted up. Public speeches were made at funerals, elections, on the arrival of governors or emperors, at the dedication of buildings, in honour of local notables and at entertainments. Attention to the written word must not blind us to the ubiquity and importance of the spoken word. Yet speech was accessible in a way that writing was not, and writing offered many kinds of security for the future, for those who could use it.

Surrounded as they were by the written word, how many of the empire's inhabitants could read it? Two problems confront any attempt to assess the extent of ancient literacy. The first is methodological. It is far from easy to decide what skills constitute the minimum requirement for an individual to be classified as literate. Does the ability to sign one's name, or to be able to read an inscription suffice? Presumably there were some who could read but not write, or who could only read a little, and others who could write a few words, perhaps only their own name like those labelled 'slow writers' in some papyri.⁸ Quantitative statements about literacy are not in themselves very informative: what would it tell us, for example, if we could be sure that 30 per cent rather than 10 per cent of the population of Roman Egypt were literate? Besides, any attempt to assess the distribution of reading and writing skills within the diverse societies of the early empire is obstructed by a second problem, the extreme paucity of evidence. What evidence there is is rarely clear cut, and the current consensus, that only a small portion of the empire's population could read or write simple Greek or Latin texts, depends largely on a priori arguments.

Perhaps the strongest of these considerations is the observation that very many of the empire's subjects do not seem to have been able to understand even spoken Latin or Greek.⁹ Most of the languages spoken within the empire were never written down, and literacy in those that were, did not always imply an ability to read and write the official languages of the empire. Alien literacies might even be the vehicle for alternative values to

⁸ Youtie (1971b).

⁹ MacMullen (1966), Millar (1968), (1971), Brunt (1976) app. 1, Millar (1987) and Neumann and Untermann (1980), Harris, *Ancient Literacy* 175–90.

those enshrined in Greco-Roman culture, as in the case of Hebrew, or perhaps written Gaulish or Egyptian Demotic. But the relationships between different languages were often more complex. Hebrew and Greek were the main languages read in Palestine, but although many could read only one or the other, some like St Paul could read both, while the most common spoken language was Aramaic. Roman Africa presents a similar pattern: some cities set up bilingual honorific inscriptions in Neo-Punic and Latin, but in addition a variety of dialects of Libyan were spoken and written in the interior.

A second set of *a priori* arguments consists of noting the conditions that made mass literacy possible in the modern world and then pointing to their absence from antiquity. Among the factors thought important in promoting modern mass literacy have been the invention of the printing press, the availability of inexpensive writing materials, a high level of urbanization, the stress on individual achievement encouraged by Protestantism and large-scale elementary education. Disagreement exists, of course, about the relative importance of each factor in recent history. It is also unclear how far each of these preconditions was absent from the ancient world. Papyrus was expensive although scraps were often available for reuse, but wooden tablets and *ostraka* were probably cheap. There were no printing presses, but the production runs of ancient texts and their cost are matters of debate.¹⁰ Levels of urbanization in the Roman empire were high by pre-modern standards but certainly a great deal lower than in more recent societies. Protestantism clearly did not exist, but other ideologies might have played similar roles, or at least have provided cultural contexts within which the written word was privileged over the spoken. The positive value set on *paideia* in much of the Hellenistic world did result in a number of educational foundations, but within that cultural system eloquent speech was valued greatly above fine writing.¹¹ The rapid social mobility suggested by the appearance of provincials in the equestrian and senatorial orders, by freedmen cults like those celebrated in most western cities by the *seviri Augustales* and by the extension of the Roman citizenship may have generated a similar concern with individual achievement. Finally, it is very difficult to assess how many children actually received elementary education.¹² Classical texts reveal ideals, rather than practice, and, as ever, are primarily concerned with a very limited sector of society. Few school buildings or inscriptions recording teachers are known, but neither are strictly necessary. Many children may have learnt to read and write from their relatives, and it is likely that some adults and children were taught within slave *familiae*. The number of different hands

¹⁰ Lewis (1974) and Turner (1978) on papyrus, Kleberg (1975) and Kenney (1982) on book production and consumption. ¹¹ Thomas (1992) 159–62 and Desbordes (1990) *passim*.

¹² Horsfall (1991), Bowman (1991).

attested on the documents from the fort of Vindolanda in northern Britain suggests that some level of literacy may often have been acquired in the army, too.

There is, in any case, a more fundamental problem in attempting to establish ancient levels of literacy in this way. Many scholars have seen 'full literacy' as part and parcel of modernity, one of the features of our world that distinguishes it from pre-modern, pre-industrial, traditional or primitive societies.¹³ Such an approach has advantages, but it can lead us to treat the writing practices of historical societies as if they were all alike, minor variants, for example, on restricted literacy.¹⁴ The differences between our civilization and Roman culture are emphasized but at the expense of the similarities, and also of the contrasts between Roman uses of writing and the literacies of, for example, classical Athens or early mediaeval Europe. Literacy levels are just one facet of this. In fact, there is not a clear-cut divide between literacy levels before and after the industrial and French revolutions, and we need to demonstrate, rather than assume, that the Roman empire had not taken an alternative route to high levels of literacy, just as the routes it took to high levels of urbanization or to economic growth differed markedly from those followed later in early modern Europe.

Documentary evidence provides the surest guide to literacy levels in any society. Egyptian papyri in particular preserve a level of documentation that has disappeared elsewhere in the empire.¹⁵ Many of these documents included autograph signatures, which Romans used as we do, in combination with witnesses, to validate legal agreements. As a result we know of hundreds of individuals who were unable to sign their names in Greek, and a few who claimed that they could write a little, but only slowly. Figures are hard to come by. Two-thirds of the cavalrymen in one unit could not write an acknowledgement for a hay allowance, and similar proportions of illiterates are recorded among the applicants for a grain dole in third-century Oxyrhynchus, among the cultivators of public land in second-century Lagis and in the contracts drawn up in the *grapheion* of Tebtunis. These documents emphasize two points. First, writing was as ubiquitous in the life of Egyptian villagers as it was in that of the townsmen of Pompeii: at Tebtunis about 700 documents were recorded in the village writing office each year, there were between 100 and 200 villagers capable of signing their

¹³ Goody (1977), Ong (1982) for this view. For critiques, Graff (1979) and Street (1984) who point out that 'full literacy' in the sense that all adults can both read and write to a reasonably high level, has not only never existed but is a characteristically modern 'myth'.

¹⁴ Goody (1968) illustrates the variety possible within this category, usually taken to describe societies in which all or most are affected by writing but in which only a few, often members of a scribal class or a clerisy, can actually read and write.

¹⁵ Majer-Leonard (1913), Calderini (1950), Youtie (1971a), (1971b), (1975a), (1975b) and Hanson (1991), Hopkins (1991) on the Egyptian evidence.

names in Greek, there was a schoolmaster and a temple library. Second, many of the participants in this literate world were clearly unable to perform even the simplest tasks with writing. Both the Egyptian and the Pompeian evidence strongly suggest that ability to write correlated with social status, and that in any status-group women were much less likely than men to be able to read and write. Nevertheless, the fact that there were clearly a number of individuals, besides the male members of the urban aristocracies of the empire, who could read and write fairly fluently, suggests that levels of literacy were high compared to those in many other ancient societies, such as Pharaonic Egypt or Achaemenid Persia. Certainly the uses of writing were much more varied and widespread than in most societies before the modern period.

How did illiterates manage in a world pervaded by the written word? By and large, with the help of literates. A frieze from the forum of Pompeii may show a literate reading out notices to a crowd of less literate bystanders. Whether or not this is the case, many notices and inscriptions must have been interpreted for those who could not read them, by those who could. The Egyptian evidence mentioned above reveals the activity of *hypographeis*, individuals signing documents on behalf of a relative, often men writing for their wives or sisters, but also on occasion for their fathers, brothers, business associates or fellow townsmen. Public scribes also act in this way, but relatives were preferred.¹⁶ Some public information, laws for example in Rome, was published by proclamation, but many official decisions were only available in written form, like the answers to letters to the emperor posted up wherever he happened to be, or the prohibitions on divination which a Severan governor ordered to be posted up in a group of Egyptian *metropoleis*.¹⁷ To be unable to read or write put the illiterate in a position of dependency on others. In theory, it also debarred him from some public offices, although we know of some officials in Egypt who could not write.¹⁸ Alongside the illiterate's need to place his trust in others in order to do business or to deal effectively with the authorities, was there also a sense of alienation from full participation in the life of the community? That alienation is a central feature of the experience of illiterates in modern society. Because reading and writing in the Roman world was not narrowly restricted to an élite, a clerisy or to professional scribes, literacy was attainable in theory even if in practice it was rarely attained. The silence of the unlettered means that we cannot know whether that possibility made illiteracy harder to bear, or whether the fact that the lack of reading and writing skills was so generalized submerged any such alienation in the general alienation of the poor and the country-dwellers from the urban populations and élites of the empire.

¹⁶ Youtie (1975a).

¹⁷ Rea (1977) on *PYale* inv. 299.

¹⁸ Hanson (1991).

II. THE USES OF WRITING

Writing had been known in the ancient Near East since the fourth millennium B.C. Over the last millennium B.C., modifications of the Phoenician alphabet came into use throughout the Mediterranean basin and beyond. But the uses made of this new technology differed enormously between areas, varying both between and within broad ethnic groups like Etruscans and Greeks. Writing continued to be used in many different ways within the diverse societies of the Roman empire, as is exemplified by the case of Egyptian Hieratic script which seems to have been largely confined to the temples. But distinctively Roman writing practices characterized this period, serving a wide variety of functions, public and private, civil and military, political, commercial and social, sacred and profane.

Most of what was ever written has long perished. Many categories of Roman documents were never intended to last long, while others were stored as part of archives, whether private like Caecilius Iucundus' records of business transactions in Pompeii, or public like the applications for the corn dole at Oxyrhynchus in Egypt, but were written on perishable materials. Notes, writing exercises and graffiti were written on *ostraka* (fragments of pottery), or on erasable wax tablets. These tablets were made of wood, covered in a layer of wax, and were written on with a stylus. Small numbers of wax tablets were sometimes bound together to make notebooks, but there was a limit to the number that might be conveniently combined.¹⁹ Wooden tablets also existed, on which messages or records might be written in ink. Lead was a more expensive and heavier medium, which had been used by Greeks and Etruscans for business letters and contracts, but although it too was reusable, its expense and weight probably prevented it ever becoming popular, except for curse tablets. Parchment and papyrus were widely used for important documents. Papyrus was the most popular high quality medium in most areas, even though Egypt was the only source of supply, but parchment had been used further east since long before the Roman conquest and papyrus only replaced it at Dura Europus, on the Euphrates, when the town was captured from the Parthians by Lucius Verus. Most surviving records on papyrus come from Egypt, and it is probable that it was cheap enough there to be used for purposes which wooden tablets would have served in other provinces. A papyrus roll cost the equivalent of between two and six days' wages for a labourer, but would have been well within the budget of many Egyptians.²⁰ But even in Egypt papyrus was zealously reused and some archives of *ostraka* were kept. Only for literary works was papyrus standard throughout the empire.

As a result, only a few collections preserved in exceptional circum-

¹⁹ Roberts and Skeat (1983). ²⁰ Lewis (1974) 129–34.

stances represent the bulk of what was ever written. We had almost no wooden writing tablets until the finds of waterlogged material from the fort at Vindolanda, parchment was known largely from Dura and these two sites between them have produced a large proportion of the military documentation known from the entire empire.²¹ Records of business deals, outside Egypt, derive mainly from three archives from the Vesuvian cities; twenty-five tablets from Transylvania and some graffiti from a Roman trading post on the Magdalensberg in modern Austria.²² The firing records from the pottery kilns at La Graufesenque are without parallel anywhere in the Roman world.²³ True, graffiti are widespread in the Roman world, and Egypt has produced a wide range of documents, but it remains the case that most Roman uses of the written word are exemplified only by tiny and scattered bodies of material, or by casual mentions in literary texts. It might seem that it would be impossible to generalize on this basis but, in fact, examination of them suggests a remarkable degree of unity in the ways in which writing and texts were used in different parts of the empire.

A degree of uniformity in the way in which the Roman military used writing, whether on papyrus or wooden writing tablets, is perhaps the least surprising aspect of this unity. I will return to it below, in discussing the extent to which the empire itself was sustained by and generated texts. But among the documents from Vindolanda are also private letters of a personal nature, some conveying news or greetings and others which are *commendationes*, requests for patronage for a third party. Egypt has also produced examples of personal letters of this sort and, in a more literary form, the letters of Pliny and Fronto have long been known. Many were actually written by a slave or a scribe, but autograph signatures were usually added. The formulae that initiate and close these letters, and some stylized forms like the *commendationes*, follow common patterns, whether written by senators or soldiers.

Commercial documents show a similar convergence. A series of Roman agricultural writers from the second century B.C. on, recommend that written records be used in the management of large estates. Cato the Elder wrote that owners should leave written instructions for their farm managers, and Varro advocated that farm bailiffs and stock managers should be literate.²⁴ Other writers dissented, but the Egyptian evidence leaves no

²¹ Bowman and Thomas, *Vindolanda I*, Bowman (1991) on Vindolanda, Perkins (1959) on Dura. Fink, *Military Records*, collects military papyri.

²² Andreau (1974) on the archive of Iucundus, Russu (1975) 165–256 on the Transylvanian tablets, first published in *CIL* III pp. 921–60; Egger (1961) and Obermayer (1971) on the Magdalensberg graffiti. On the archive of the Sulpicii, found in the villa of Murecine outside Pompeii, see now Camodeca (1999); cf. the preliminary reports in *Rendiconti Napoli* 1966–, *AE* and Crook (1978). The Herculaneum tablets (the archive of Poppaea) were published in successive issues of *Parola del Passato* and are described in Pugliese-Caratelli (1950). ²³ Marichal (1988).

²⁴ Cato, *Agr.* 2.6, Varro, *Rust.* I.17.4; I.36.1; II.1.23; II.10.10.

doubt that written records were extensively used in the running of large estates. A large number of records survives from a third-century estate owned by an Alexandrine councillor named Appianus.²⁵ It comprised a number of separate farms and properties scattered throughout the Arsinoite nome. A central office in the nome capital oversaw more than thirty local village offices. Each local manager prepared elaborate accounts, detailing leases, payments, expenses and receipts on behalf of the estate, and submitted copies to the central office. Communications between Appianus, the central office and the village managers were managed largely by letter, and records were kept both in the villages and at Arsinoe, as well as presumably by Appianus himself.

Any business activity that involved substantial sums of money seems to have made extensive use of writing. The archives found in the Vesuvian cities have already been mentioned. Sixteen of Caecilius Iucundus' tablets record a series of contracts between himself and the city of Pompeii, but the remaining 137 refer to auctions of property undertaken by Iucundus on behalf of third parties. The tablets record the names of the vendors, some of whom also seem to have had money on deposit with Iucundus, and the names of witnesses to the arrangements. Only three tablets concerned sales worth less than 1,000 HS, the top three were for sums in excess of 30,000 HS, while the median value was 4,500 HS. Another series of Pompeian documents, from the Villa Murecine, relates to the diversified financial activities of the Sulpicii in Puteoli, recording imports, exports, loans secured against property, the auction and redemption of deposited goods and also legal guarantees. Similar tablets have been found in Herculaneum. Those from Rosia Montana in Transylvania include bills of sale for slaves, work contracts, records of loans and various documents concerning the setting up and dissolution of partnerships. The individuals involved were miners from Dalmatia, exploiting the opportunities opened up by Trajan's conquest of Dacia. Related commercial uses of writing are suggested by the 300-odd graffiti from the Magdalensberg which record the export of iron goods manufactured in Noricum to various cities in northern Italy, and beyond. The quantities of goods concerned are again substantial: plates, jugs and cauldrons were bought and sold in their hundreds, smaller items in batches of five hundred or so. One inscription records an Aquileian merchant buying 110 cauldrons, each weighing 15 pounds, and other graffiti record loans, credit and cash transactions. The firing records from La Graufesenque in southern France record fairly large batches of pottery, and most of the 213 records refer to that period in the first century A.D. when those workshops supplied *terra sigillata* to much of the Roman north-west. Most are simply itemized lists, but at least one contract exists,

²⁵ Turner (1978), Rathbone, *Economic Rationalism*.

similar to those from Transylvania, and from Egypt we know of a third century A.D. lease on a pottery kiln which required the lessee to produce more than 15,000 jars in the course of the two years.²⁶ Potters' stamps on finewares, and the stamps and painted labels on container amphorae, are equally a feature of large-scale productions. Many other types of transaction are known from Egypt, where copies of private contracts were stored in village archives. That level of recording has yet to be attested for any other province, and may be an Egyptian peculiarity, but in the case of larger transactions the Egyptian evidence may reasonably be taken to be representative. Roman legal texts at least imply that written contracts were common in all areas of economic activity and that they were necessary for any citizens who wished to take full advantage of the law to safeguard their business interests. Clearly, there was a broadly similar commercial literacy among the institutions that united the empire at an economic level. Both the estates and the business deals mentioned in the extant documents were substantial. But the Transylvanian miners, who seem not all to have been citizens, and the south Gaulish potters, who used Gallic words alongside Latin ones in their tallies, show that written contracts and accounts were not the prerogative of the imperial and municipal aristocracies. Writing was used when substantial amounts of money, rather than prominent individuals, were involved.

Compared to the huge extant body of classical epigraphy and literature, these uses of the written word, now so rarely preserved, might seem at first sight mundane. But the familiarity of these documents is deceptive. In fact, they encapsulate a combination of the utilitarian and the symbolic that characterized all Roman writing. Iucundus had his documents signed by witnesses, but they signed in order of social status. The Egyptian *hypographeis* were not simply writing on behalf of another, but also adding their support to the document and the transaction it recorded, and a scribe who did not know the individual for whom he wrote took care to signal that fact. Letters were signed by hand not just to authenticate the contents, which were often trivial, but also as a gesture of intimacy. Roman writing retained this blend of the pragmatic and the symbolic, irrespective of whether the medium used was permanent, like stone, or perishable, like wood.

Religious practice illustrates some of the similarities and differences in the ways different media were used.²⁷ One widespread custom was to make an offering in a temple to mark the taking or fulfilling of a vow. Celebrants might bring wooden placards on which the reasons for vows were advertised and having carried the placards in procession would leave them in the temple. But even the smallest votive might be accompanied by a little notice and the walls of some temples and the branches of some sacred trees were

²⁶ Cockle (1981). ²⁷ Veyne (1983), Beard (1991).

covered with them. Lead tablets were inscribed with curses and consigned to various gods at shrines throughout the Roman world from Delos to Bath.²⁸ Not all votives were written: images of parts of the human body often commemorated cures, although Asclepius required some of those he cured at Epidaurus in Greece to have their cure inscribed in stone in the sanctuary. The Arval Brethren at Rome also made the recording of their ceremonies on stone an integral part of their cultic activity.²⁹ The most prestigious sacrifices were recorded not on wooden placards but by the dedication of stone altars, often inscribed with a suitable epigraph. A military commander dedicated an altar every year as part of his unit's celebration of the imperial cult. Two temples on either side of the southernmost mouth of the Rhine accumulated a collection of altars offered to the local goddess Nehallenia by merchants working the Channel crossing. Some at least of their vows were fulfilled in return for safe journeys home.

How did Romans differentiate between the various writing media available? Most prestigious of all were inscriptions in bronze, the medium for treaties and laws, a medium which perhaps always conveyed some element of the sacred.³⁰ When Horace wrote that he had established with his poetry a monument that would last longer than bronze, he made the familiar equation of permanence and importance which was fundamental to the Roman concept of *monumentum*. Yet impermanent materials were used for very much the same purposes, and it would be equally possible to differentiate between these texts in terms of function, curses and acts of worship, commemoration of cures or a celebration of the religious *acta* of various associations, from a military contingent to a burial club or a college of priests. Central to many ritual uses of writing was a desire to mark an act of communication between human and divine, whether a vow, a request or a simple act of recognition, as in the case of soldiers in northern Britain who set up altars *Genio Loci*, to the spirit of the locality. Writing was one way of signalling the reciprocal relationship that existed between gods and men. But there were also other ways of expressing and maintaining this relationship, especially the dedication of non-written images, votive offerings or the performing of sacrifices. The importance of writing was that it was one way of memorializing and personalizing the religious act.

However permanent epigraphy may have seemed, only a tiny proportion of Roman inscriptions has survived. Bronzes have been melted down or lost and stone has crumbled or been recut, buried or melted in mediaeval lime-kilns. As a result, extant inscriptions represent at most 5 per cent of those ever set up.³¹ Only in exceptional cases can we estimate the number of inscriptions originally on display in a Roman town. Ostia, the port of Rome covered by silt and then extensively excavated, has produced more

²⁸ Tomlin and Walker (1988).

²⁹ Beard (1985).

³⁰ Williamson (1987).

³¹ Duncan-Jones, *Economy* app. 13.

than 3,000 inscriptions. Pompeii, buried by the eruption of Vesuvius in A.D. 79, has produced more than 11,000 examples of writing, most of them epigraphic.

Public records in stone and bronze were displayed in the centre of towns, on the walls of monuments and particularly on those surrounding the forum. Temples often acted as repositories for the most important public documents. At Rome, thousands of bronze tablets were displayed on the Capitol, recording treaties, decrees of the Senate, laws voted by the assemblies and grants of citizenship.³² Other cities imitated the practice, often on their own initiative, but occasionally at the request of Roman authorities. The *Res Gestae* of Augustus were circulated to every city in the empire as was the record of the honours passed by the Senate on the death of Germanicus. The practice of having Roman statutes monumentalized throughout the empire was relatively short-lived, beginning in the late Republic with the *popularis* politics of the Gracchi and their successors and ending in the Julio-Claudian period,³³ but Italian and provincial communities continued to display *senatus consulta*, *leges*, *edicta* and imperial letters that affected them in particular. All Latin *municipia* must have displayed municipal laws, like that found recently at Irni in southern Spain.³⁴ These laws comprised model constitutions designed to regulate the public life of communities in accordance with Roman law and custom. One clause required the town's chief magistrates to have the law inscribed in bronze at once, and to display it in the most prominent place possible in the *municipium* so that it might be clearly read from ground level. The formula is known from other documents. We do not know what place the *duumvir* chose for its display, but the copy we have would have been about nine metres in width and more than half a metre high, and the tablets are pierced for attachment to a wall. Other important documents on display in municipal temples or *scriptoria* would include land registers, like those known from Orange in southern France, and any text that emanated from the emperor, especially letters bestowing or confirming privileges. Large dossiers of correspondence with various emperors are known from cities like Aphrodisias and Ephesus.³⁵ Their display was a visible symbol of a city's importance within the empire, of the emperor's virtue and of the role played by particular local grandees as ambassadors, magistrates and power brokers. The Italian towns that benefited from Trajan's alimentary schemes displayed huge bronze inscriptions recording the emperor's *indulgentia* and the names of the local landowners who had mortgaged their lands to him so that the interest on the loans might provide gifts of cash for the maintenance of local children. Emperors, like gods, were honoured for favours bestowed and favours anticipated, and the monumentalizing of their 'sacred letters'

³² Suet. *Vesp.* 8. ³³ Crawford (1988). ³⁴ González (1986).

³⁵ Reynolds, *Aphrodisias* on Aphrodisias. For Ephesus *IEph* I–VIII with discussion by Rogers (1991) ch. 1.

reciprocated those favours as well as publicizing and guaranteeing them.

Perhaps the most prominent feature of the epigraphy of the cities of the empire is the prominence of names in every category of inscription: votive, honorific and above all funerary. At Canusium, an *album* lists the names of the community's patrons, in order of status, whether senatorial or equestrian, and then all the *ex-quinquennales*, *ex-duoviri* and all those who had held lesser magistracies and finally ordinary town councillors of various grades.³⁶ A patron was in addition presented with a bronze *tabula patronatus* recording the decree of their cooptation, the magistrates concerned and the individuals chosen to present it to him for display in his *atrium* in Rome.³⁷ The fora of most towns contained free-standing statues of prominent men. Integral to these monuments were inscriptions announcing the identity of each dignitary, listing the priesthoods and local magistracies he had held, and maybe other services he had performed, buildings restored, embassies undertaken, charitable foundations set up and extraordinary acts of generosity. Names were also prominent in the largest category of inscriptions, funerary monuments. Roman tombstones are so familiar, that it is easy to forget that naming the departed is not a necessary part of mortuary ritual and that Romans were more concerned than most peoples to name the commemorator as well.³⁸ The memorializing of names and relationships seems as important in death as in life. The words were only one part of a monument, of course, whether honorific or funerary. All the same, it is clear that Romans hoped to have their names as well as their images prominent both in the *necropolis* and the forum.

This concern, typical of the early empire, to assert individual achievement and status, and the relationships between individuals, may reflect conditions of increased social mobility within the empire. The inscriptions reflect not only the increased possibilities to achieve, but also the sense of insecurity that accompanied it. Inscriptions mark both the success of the upwardly mobile, like the fictional Trimalchio,³⁹ and the anxieties of those who felt themselves threatened by it. Monumentalization in many societies is seen to be a response to conditions of social change, driven by a desire to assert the stability of the social order and the strength of traditional values in the face of threats to both. Some support for this hypothesis is offered when variations in the density of inscriptions in different parts of the empire are mapped out and when variations over time are taken into account.⁴⁰ The density of surviving Latin inscriptions is uneven, stronger in Italy than in the provinces, in the Mediterranean world than in the western provinces (except where there were concentrations of soldiers)

³⁶ *CIL* ix 338.

³⁷ E.g. *CIL* vi 1492.

³⁸ Meyer (1990).

³⁹ Horsfall (1989).

⁴⁰ MacMullen (1982) on variations in time, with Mrozek (1973), (1988). Geographical variation between Italian *regiones* in Duncan-Jones, *Economy* 339, and between western provinces in Harris, *Ancient Literacy* 268. Meyer (1990) suggests one explanation stressing citizenship and testation.

and, within Italy, strongest in western central Italy around Rome. At least in geographical terms, epigraphic density correlates roughly with urbanization, the military and romanization, all thought to have promoted social mobility. A clear rise and fall in the epigraphic habit over time can also be detected, rising to a peak at the end of the second century A.D. and declining rapidly in the third. No consensus exists as to the reasons for this pattern, but it corresponds roughly with the rate of enfranchisement, in so far as we can trace it, up until the point at which Caracalla in 212 gave the citizenship to almost every free-born inhabitant of the empire and, by doing so, stopped it being a status indicator. Other kinds of monuments may also reflect changing hierarchies of status within the empire, for example between cities, and the competition and anxiety generated by these changes. But epigraphy is remarkable in that it so clearly attempts to establish a definitive statement of the status of individuals and their positions in a nexus of social relationships.

Ephemeral accounts and letters and contracts were the commonest kind of documents produced in the Roman empire, while the most prominent were ubiquitous monuments set up in stone and bronze. Romans made no hard and fast distinction between perishable and permanent, but rather conceived of a spectrum ranging from *ostraka* to bronze. That that continuum reflected cultural value, rather than durability, is shown by the fact that most bronze inscriptions have long been melted down while *ostraka*, non-reusable and virtually indestructible, have survived in huge numbers. But all of these documents together constituted a public culture, in the sense that access to reading, writing and texts *per se* was not restricted, and there was no sense of literacy being the exclusive prerogative of a few, whether low-status scribes or high-status clerics.

Cultures of exclusion existed, but based not on writing but on the capacity to produce and appreciate particular uses of language that were more often spoken than written. A number of different 'high cultures' coexisted, to some extent in competition. One example is provided by Latin poetry, which drew on Greek and Italian sources to produce complex pieces which, in their vocabulary, metre and allusions to a wide range of philosophical, mythological and historical themes, as well as to other poems, operated to exclude all but the most discerning audience.⁴¹ The amount of commentary necessary even to make one of Horace's *Odes* or Virgil's *Eclogues* comprehensible to a modern reader illustrates the exclusiveness of the form. For the ancients, of course, 'audience' is more appropriate than 'reader', since Latin poetry was designed to be read aloud, sometimes by the poet but more often by a reader the poet considered to be more perfect

⁴¹ One of the most persistent jokes in Petronius' *Cena Trimalchionis* turns on the rich freedman's failure to participate in this culture however much money he invests in attempting to do so; cf. Horsfall (1989).

in pronunciation, rather as a composer might prefer to have his piece performed by a musician rather than by himself.⁴² Grammarians devoted considerable attention to proper pronunciation and it was clear that the written text was conceived of as secondary to the spoken, in the same way we consider a musical score as secondary to a performance.⁴³ Even when reading to oneself, it was normal to read aloud in order to fully appreciate a poetic work. Rhetoric, both Latin and Greek, might be equally exclusive.⁴⁴ Public speaking had many uses in the courts, in politics before an assembly, a council, a governor or even the emperor, and also as a form of virtuoso performance art. Naturally, the occasion influenced the form of rhetoric used, and orators often specialized in one or other branch. But, at the level of high culture, rhetoric could be as allusive as poetry and just as concerned with pronunciation and performance, while it offered additional scope for feats of memory and improvisation and for competition to present familiar themes, such as a speech advising Hannibal to march on Rome, in new and original ways.

Few could compete with the trained sophists and orators, but it was possible to learn to appreciate oratory. The educational establishments of which we know the most taught precisely this, that cultural discrimination that the Romans called *studia* and the Greeks *paideia*. Educated Romans, of course, were expected to appreciate Greek fine speaking as well as Latin. How many in the West ever achieved this is very unclear. Latin 'literary culture' itself is best known from the city of Rome, although many writers came from the more romanized provinces where there were many colonies of Roman citizens. The Senecas and Martial originated in Spain; Apuleius, Fronto and Tertullian in Africa; and Tacitus may have come from southern France. Although most gravitated to Rome, their capacity to do so indicates some level of education in the major cities of the Latin West about which we are almost completely ignorant in this period apart from a few references to the schools of Autun where the Gallic élites had their sons educated.⁴⁵ Many more centres existed in the East for sophists to perform and teach in, pre-eminently Athens but also other major cities like Corinth, Ephesus, Smyrna and Antioch. Greek culture excluded doubly, asserting not only the superiority of particular classes in Greek civic society, but also the superiority of Greek culture over Latin. From the viewpoint of literacy, however, the important point is that the distinction between high culture and low does not coincide with that between written and oral but to some extent cuts across it, and on occasion seems to have privileged spoken over written. Books played a part in this culture, as imperfect *monumenta* of speech, and were exchanged, given, copied and collected by some aristocrats, like the enthusiast who compiled the philosoph-

⁴² Knox (1968).⁴³ Desbordes (1990) ch. 6.⁴⁴ Kennedy (1972).⁴⁵ Haarhof (1920).

ical library in the Villa of the Papyri at Pompeii. A small number of private collections of this sort are attested in Italy, and libraries were among the benefits bestowed by the emperor on Rome and by aristocrats on their home towns, as Pliny the Younger did for Comum.⁴⁶ But even Pliny used slaves both to write down his compositions and also to read them out, and his Panegyric of Trajan shows that he was an adept of rhetorical culture in its spoken, as well as its written, form.

III. AN EMPIRE OF WORDS?

Many writers have postulated connections between the written word and political power.⁴⁷ No states have existed without at least some records, with which resources may be controlled, and without some medium for communication at a distance. Many have also used writing to create images of power and legitimacy, through propaganda and censorship. These two aspects of writing are in practice never completely separable: for example, written laws serve many pragmatic functions, but it is also important to the subjects that the laws are written down, rather than arbitrary, and important to the rulers that they may portray themselves as issuers and guarantors of the laws.

The profoundly literate nature of the Roman empire makes it unsurprising that writing was used in both these ways by Roman authorities. But what is particularly striking is that Romans do not seem to have developed specifically political uses of writing, but rather used writing in the running of the empire in much the same ways as they used it in the private sphere. The Roman state did use writing to control the empire, but largely through harnessing the writing practices of a literate society to imperial ends rather than by the creation of a new bureaucracy.

The point emerges very strongly from a consideration of the issue of bureaucracy. This term is usually taken, after Max Weber, to refer to a style of government characterized by large numbers of state employees, organized in a hierarchical structure, within which there is a very clear division of responsibilities and functions. Bureaucrats tend to assimilate individual cases to generic categories and to deal with them accordingly. Roman government is widely held to be the antithesis of that sort of bureaucracy. The emperor's relationship with his subjects was highly personalized. Armies were led, and provinces governed and taxed, by aristocrats with no specialized training and little experience. Their careers followed no rigid patterns, they were selected on the basis of moral character and personal favour and they discharged their functions not through a civil service, but with the help of their own families and connections and a few soldiers and

⁴⁶ Wallace-Hadrill (1983) 81–2, Rawson (1985) 39–45.

⁴⁷ Larsen (1988) for a survey.

imperial slaves. The burden of administration was devolved to local élites and private individuals who took public contracts. Roman officials were expected to exercise a general watching brief and to deal with crises as they thought best. Their conduct was governed by their *officium* rather than the rule book.

Yet writing proliferated here, as in every other sphere of Roman life. Although most ephemeral writings have perished, the military records found from Dura, the tablets from Vindolanda and the thousands of *ostraka* found at the imperial mines at Mons Claudianus in Egypt together indicate the huge amount of documentation that was once produced. The papyri from Dura included records for the cohorts XX Palmyrenorum, including daily reports, correspondence, guard rotas, records of legal decisions and receipts. At Vindolanda, the texts include requests for leave, unit records showing the current location of various soldiers, letters, military intelligence and *commendationes*, references written to recommend an individual to another's attention. Similar records are known from Dura Europus. Military papyri recording the pay of individual soldiers, with deductions, are also known. Writing was clearly important in the army in managing the supply and movements of large numbers of men and goods, in coordinating the activities of different units and in maintaining an intelligence advantage over potential enemies. Frontier systems comprised complex communication networks and writing played an important role, along with roads and signal towers, in transmitting information along them. The importance of writing in the mundane operations of the army is attested by the large numbers of soldiers known to be able to pen a simple message. Many of the procedures of the army, such as posting the guard, demanded a fair number of literate soldiers.⁴⁸ Auxiliary cavalrymen in Egypt were asked to sign receipts for hay allowances, and almost a third of those recorded on one papyrus could oblige. Both in this document and in the material from Vindolanda, a wide variety of individual hands is known.

Non-military uses of writing are known primarily from Roman Egypt. The extent to which it is possible to generalize from Egyptian material to the empire at large is a matter of some dispute; on the other hand it is possible that Roman government resulted in a marked increase in the extent to which writing was used in running the province.⁴⁹ The texts include receipts for a wide variety of taxes and customs payments. Within villages, censuses were carried out and substantial amounts of written material flowed up and down the administrative hierarchy. We know a reasonable amount about the role of local scribes through a few well-preserved archives, and the range of issues they dealt with, primarily fiscal but also juridical. Outside Egypt, we are most aware of traffic in the upper reaches

⁴⁸ Best (1966–7).

⁴⁹ Hopkins (1991).

of the hierarchy, for example the written appeals sent to the emperor, at the bottom of which the emperor wrote a brief reply, a *subscriptum*, before having the letters posted up to be read. Occasionally a rescript might find its way into a more permanent medium, an inscription or a jurist's collection of imperial rulings on a given issue. But most have perished like the private ephemera.

Nevertheless, the volume of letters exchanged between Pliny and Trajan during the former's governorship of Bithynia indicates the total amount of writing that might be involved in running at least some parts of the empire.⁵⁰ So, too, does the post at court of *ab epistulis*, later differentiated into two equestrian secretaries, one dealing with Latin correspondence and the other with Greek. One component of the good emperor, as idealized in the second century A.D., was that he worked hard at answering this correspondence and heard his subjects' petitions for justice. It is a major gap in our knowledge of the emperor's activities that the nature of the evidence means we know little about the volume of communications between the court and the military, but it seems unlikely that more attention was paid to Greek cities than to the troops, or to Bithynia than to the Germans. Roman writers seem to assume that emperors are well aware of what was happening at the front, even if they did not always choose to publicize it. Republican aristocrats of the Ciceronian period were very well informed about current campaigns, as were Republican governors of events at Rome. Emperors had much greater resources at their disposal, so that it occasioned no surprise when Tiberius was able to keep track of two mutinies, and later a serious revolt, from Rome, or when Claudius was able to arrive in Britain at just the right moment to associate himself with the conquest but to avoid any danger. Hadrian's long period of touring the empire with the court would have been impossible without a well-developed system of communications, which is even more impressive in view of the well-known obstacles to efficient communications in the ancient world.⁵¹ So, too, centralized accounts must have been produced and continually updated in order to manage cash-flow, in an economy with very underdeveloped credit facilities, and in particular to coordinate income and expenditure on an empire-wide scale. The detail with which individual soldiers' pay was accounted for implies that the records kept centrally were at least as sophisticated. The occasional failure to recover old records from the central archives does not indicate that it was not thought desirable to do so or even that the problem was a normal one.

Roman government depended heavily on the written word, and yet it was not bureaucratic, as Weber defined bureaucracy as a particular style of government, an ethic within which rules and regulations are more impor-

⁵⁰ Pliny, *Ep.* x *passim*.

⁵¹ Millar (1982), Duncan-Jones, *Structure* 7–29.

tant than informal relationships. Bureaucracy treats personal ties like patronage as subversive and illicit, whereas for Pliny it was a solemn duty to support his *amici*. Like the officers at Vindolanda, he used writing to carry out this *officium* by producing *commendationes*, and the honouring of patrons and assisting of clients was so far from illicit that it forms a major concern of his letters, and so part of his idealized autobiography. Another instance of the way that the patrimonial government of the empire made use of writing is offered by one of the documents included with Augustus' will and read out to the Senate on his death.⁵² This was a brief account of the empire, of the location of the armies and fleets and of the regular revenues and expenditure. The document concluded with the names of the imperial freedmen who could provide further details on each topic. What the document illustrates is the way that Augustus ran the empire through his own *familia*. Just as his sons and *amici* managed the campaigns of conquest in Europe, so his ex-slaves ran the financial and logistical concerns of the empire. At an early stage, he had even entrusted tax-collection to his ex-slaves. Over the first century minor aristocrats came to replace freedmen, first in the collection of taxes and then in positions at the head of the imperial departments of state. But the empire continued to be run in a way similar to the large financial concerns owned by private individuals, to large estates, potteries, export companies and the like. Patrimonial government consisting in running the empire without new specialized uses of writing, but rather by adopting and adapting the already sophisticated devices used to manage the complex private affairs of Roman aristocrats.

The close relationship between private and public records may be illustrated in a number of other spheres. The Vindolanda documents, many of which emanate from the *praetorium*, the commanding officer's house and office, are a mixture of private correspondence and military business, all written in a similar way on the same materials. Dura has produced a quantity of non-military documentation. Among the texts from the registry are marriage contracts, leases and contracts, some of them involving soldiers engaging in transactions with locals. Soldiers also appear in the documents from the private archive of Babatha.⁵³ The lodging of private documents in the official *grapheia* of Egyptian villages indicates a similar trend, while the officials themselves were not trained civil servants but men of middle rank whose main experience was in managing their own property in a similar village. Much state administration, throughout the empire, was managed by private contractors, as were many of the public concerns of the cities. Contractors usually had to own substantial property which provided surety for their fulfilling their contracts. These might be for the collection of indirect taxes, the maintenance of amenities or services or

⁵² Suet. *Aug.* 101, Tac. *Ann.* 1.111.

⁵³ Lewis, Yadin and Greenfield, *Documents of Bar Kokhba*.

simply for farming city or imperial land. We must presume that they used writing to manage these concerns, just as they used it to manage their own.

Emperors also made less mundane uses of the written word, although again the line between pragmatic and symbolic usage is not easy to draw. The *census* is a good example of a device that served both pragmatic fiscal demands, yet also might be understood as a statement about the power of the empire to dominate its subjects, by making them objects to be counted and used. Similar arguments have been advanced about cartography, centuriation and the punctuation of the new road systems with milestones, inscribed in Latin. At one level the concern with compiling lists and records and accounts of the empire may be seen as good management, by the *familia Caesaris*, of its varied concerns, but at another the records produced may be set alongside Augustus' *Res Gestae* as rhetorical gestures.⁵⁴ The emperors also manipulated texts in more straightforwardly symbolic ways: libraries were built in Rome, like those constructed by Trajan, constructed as part of his monumental complex along with the column, the forum and the market. The practice, like the patronage of poets, echoed aristocratic fashion, as well as the activities of the Hellenistic kings who had inspired it. Books might also be burned if they were regarded as subversive of the regime.⁵⁵ A more popular gesture was to publicly burn records of tax arrears: the importance of the act at a symbolic level is emphasized by depictions of these bonfires.⁵⁶

But it is important not to overestimate the significance of written words among a wide range of potential symbols. Many other media were used for this sort of display and just as the erasure of the name was only one component of *damnatio memoriae*, which also included the destruction of images, so the burning of books was just one feature of restrictions on free speech thought characteristic of bad emperors in general. Besides, spoken words were as dangerous as written ones, and might attract as violent reactions.⁵⁷

One difficulty in assessing the symbolic power of the written word is that it rarely appeared alone, rather than as a component of some other monument, whether a coin, a statue or a building. It is easy to misunderstand the significance of inscriptions in particular by decontextualizing them, removing them from their setting, ignoring their format and focusing on the text rather than the artefact. Many inscriptions can only have been dedicated because they were more important as things, than as texts. So municipal laws were set up in public not for ease of reference, as a roll might have been easier to refer to, but to symbolize the status of the town and the importance that Rome attached to it. Imperial letters only rarely contained similar clauses commanding that they be converted into monuments, and

⁵⁴ Nicolet (1988). ⁵⁵ E.g. Suet. *Tib.* 61.3, *Gaius* 16.1, Tac. *Agr.* 2, *Ann.* IV.35.

⁵⁶ *HA Hadr.* 7 depicted on the *Anaghypha Traiani*. ⁵⁷ Eg. Tac. *Dial.* 2, *Ann.* I.12.

other explanations must be sought for their display. The display of the 'sacred letters' of the emperor served several purposes, signalling the distinction paid to the city, the skill of the ambassadors who had won a favourable reply with their rhetoric, and asserted the loyalty of the city to Rome, and the services rendered to its people by its élite.

But this is simply the overt content of the inscriptions. Treating them as monuments rather than as texts suggests other interpretations. Monumentality, I have suggested, more often indicates fear of change and social tension, than complacency and stability. The proliferation of inscriptions celebrating the good relations between city and empire at first sight presents an impression of a peaceful and harmonious relationship between rulers and ruled, and an expression of the symbolic unit of the empire. But, like the panegyrics of the second sophistic and the imperial cult, the inscriptions might be seen as devices to exercise power over the emperors, by asserting an ideal rapport and imposing on them the role of benefactors. Failed (or even unanswered?) embassies, after all, were not commemorated. Overt statements might have operated as an ideological device to deny tensions between the emperors and their subjects, and between rich and poor in the cities, while expressions of both rivalry and harmony with other cities might conceal an anxiety that many individuals might no longer care whether they were Ephesians or Smyrnaeans. In a similar way, coins issued during civil wars often bore legends like 'Concord' or 'Peace of the Whole World', attempts both to allay fears and to assert a new reality.

Other forms of writing might express tensions between rulers and ruled. Greek hostility to Latin written culture has already been mentioned. Another strategy was to write in another language, Punic in Africa, Celtic in Gaul, Demotic in Egypt. Some non-classical literacies, for example Syriac and Hebrew, may have been simply the continuation of ancient literary traditions independent of the empire, but others seem deliberately to have been created as alternatives to classical writing. Demotic Egyptian seems to have been rigorously purged of Greek loanwords while some Gauls produced Celtic versions of quintessentially Latin documents such as curse tablets and religious calendars. These writers clearly knew the canons of Greek and Latin writing but deliberately rejected them. But it is unclear how far writing was conceived of as a particularly Roman practice. Most areas of the empire, in the West as well as in the East, had been aware of writing before the conquest. Romans themselves sometimes conceived of writing as one component of *humanitas*, civilization as invented by the Greeks and propagated in the West by the Romans, but on the whole they followed the Greeks in acknowledging that writing was widespread and distinguishing groups more by their customs, their appearance and their language. The deliberate rejection of Latin for Celtic, and of

Greek for Egyptian, may have been more significant than the written medium.

What can be said in conclusion about the importance of writing for the Roman empire? Certainly writing was necessary for the way the empire was organized, but it would be a mistake (the graphocentrism to which studies of literacy, in general, are notoriously prone) to overemphasize writing at the expense of other factors. As an organizational technology, writing was vital, but so were ships, iron-working and coinage. As a symbolic medium writing played a part, but perhaps not as great a part as statuary or gifts. How could we tell? Perhaps the most revealing conclusions are those that allow us to distinguish our society from theirs in respect of the relationship between power and the written word. There were no specialized writing practices in the empire, no bureaucracy and no sharp divide between the way that private affairs were run and how the empire was managed. At the level of symbolism, in government as in society at large, the written word was not so valued above the spoken one, nor was writing a privileged medium for the propagation of images. Despite the huge volume of writing produced in running the Roman empire, and the text-based view we have of it, power was more closely associated with speaking than writing. Whether the object was to sway the emperor or the illiterate masses, speech, not writing, was the essential skill to master in order to make friends and influence people in the Roman empire.

CHAPTER 31

LITERATURE AND SOPHISTIC

EWEN BOWIE

Until the wars of A.D. 68 to 70 the empire had enjoyed a century of peace. Its cities, the chief vehicles of Roman imperial culture, had grown in number, size and prosperity. In the West whole provinces, like Lusitania and the Three Gauls, saw a network of cities of the Graeco-Roman type superimposed on their previous town and village structures. Even in others that had long had cities, like Baetica and Narbonensis, the number and size of cities grew. The same happened in the eastern empire. There many more provinces already boasted Greek cities where the élites lived their cultured lives, though there were some, like Celtic Galatia, where city life was only developing, and others with large tracts of land where villages were the rule. The foundation of cities continued through into the third century, but in the years from 70 to 192 a number of factors combined to accelerate the efflorescence of the Greek cities of the eastern empire. The philhellenism of Nero and his gift of 'freedom' to Greece was a false dawn. But Vespasian's revoking of the latter was less important than his admission of many easterners to the Senate, often some places up the *cursus*, partly a consequence of his eastern power-base in the civil wars. Admission of easterners continued under Domitian and increased under Trajan. By Hadrian's accession there was a significant caucus of Greek-speaking senators who might draw imperial attention and favour towards Greek cities, especially their own. The shifting of Rome's chief engagement with northern barbarians from the Rhine to the Danube frontier made some contribution to bringing the cities of Macedonia and even Achaëa nearer to centre-stage, while military movement along the Bosphorus and Dardanelles routes that linked the northern and eastern frontiers had discernible economic effects on the eastern Balkans and parts of Asia Minor, notably Bithynia.

Throughout these cities of the empire was spread an élite which defined itself as much in terms of culture as of wealth. For almost all western cities the language of culture was Latin and the texts which formed the canon of literature were those of republican, especially late republican, and early imperial Rome. To most members of the Greek élites of the eastern empire these texts were either wholly unfamiliar or known only in snippets and at

second hand. Whereas the best-educated westerner would read Greek as well as Latin, could with pleasure and profit attend performances of Greek works, and might argue about the respective merits of Greek and Latin writings, only the easterners who became part of the Roman system of government, whether as senators or members of the equestrian service, or as soldiers in the army, are certain to have had a working knowledge of Latin, and only Greek historians who decided to write about Rome show signs of having read substantial portions of Latin texts.

This is in no way surprising, given the long pedigree and immense prestige of Greek literary culture. Before Latin literature had staggered its first imitative steps, Greek education and culture had been diffused by Alexander's conquests not simply across the eastern Mediterranean but as far as Afghanistan and India. Settlers maintained and natives acquired a Greek identity by an education centred upon a canon of texts headed by Homer, Euripides, Plato, Demosthenes and Menander. We have little evidence that this system changed, and much that it did not, in the four centuries that separate Nero's death from Alexander's. By acquiring a text-oriented knowledge of classical Greek alongside the *koiné* employed in daily political, social and commercial life, a citizen of Borysthene or Cyrene, of Nicomedeia or of Tyre, could enrol himself into the worldwide imagined community of Hellenes, and could rely on his education to establish common bonds of Hellenism with educated people he encountered from other parts of the Greek universe. In the Roman empire many Greeks did travel, as merchants, as envoys to other cities, to *koina* or to the emperor, as tourists in pursuit of general knowledge or as pupils seeking instruction from a sophist or philosopher. For these, Hellenic education will have been an almost indispensable passport. But the majority, even of the educated classes, will never have left their province: for them, the common traditions of the Greek world were even more important, since they guaranteed them membership of a community whose geographical extension could with licence be seen as the inhabited world and whose origins could be traced back to the age of heroes.¹

At the highest social level the basic education that gave an entrée to this intellectual community could be taken for granted. Matters are much less clear as we move down the social scale, though it is certain that education could promote upward mobility. It is also hard, if not impossible, to quantify the proportion of the highest social class, the city aristocracies, who continued their education to a 'tertiary' level by studying rhetoric or philosophy. But again one thing is clear: the teachers of philosophy and, even more, of rhetoric were accorded high esteem, they were often themselves from families of the highest social and economic status, and their exercise

¹ For the continuing role of Hellenism cf. Bowersock (1990).

of their intellectual skills was not limited to the instruction of the young but extended to public declamations and lectures.

I. SOPHISTIC RHETORIC

The lectures (*dialexeis*) and declamations (*meletai*) delivered by the more eminent practitioners and teachers of rhetoric (or 'sophists') can be seen as the most important single distinguishing mark of the Greek culture of this period.² That was certainly the view of Philostratus, himself a *rhetor*, whose *Lives of the Sophists*, completed about A.D. 238, stresses not only the cultural but also the social and political importance of sophists from Nicetes of Smyrna (under Nero) to his own time. It may indeed have been the view of many Greeks of that period, although Philostratus may tailor his pattern to match his information,³ and much of our evidence comes from biased sources – the self-confident claims of men like Dio Chrysostom and Aristides who were themselves sophists, or the satirical and distorting mirror of Lucian, who once had been, and who developed his own brand of literary entertainment on a sophistic base. But the range of literary activities becomes much wider when glimpsed through the pages of Plutarch, Gellius, Galen or Athenaeus, and although these may not shift rhetorical declamation from its place in the centre of the picture, they leave it with a much smaller section of the canvas.

The forty-four biographies of Philostratus present considerable variations, but some features must have been common to many sophistic careers.⁴ A young man who seemed to his local *rhetor* to be gifted would move to one of the major centres of sophistic, Ephesus, Smyrna or Athens, and there attend the courses given by an established maestro. If precocious, he might be picked out as a favourite pupil and soon begin teaching and declaiming himself in one of these centres: men of lesser talent might have to settle for teaching rhetoric in a smaller city. In either case, he might travel in the expectation that his declamations would acquire him honours and fees from cities and individuals. For many, declamation and teaching were complementary aspects of the career: indeed, a major part of the teaching was made up of paradigmatic declamation, and it will have been the nature of the audience rather than the content of a *melete* or the manner of its delivery that distinguished public performances from school lessons. A *rhetor* who taught privately but did not undertake public teaching or declamation might be said 'not to be engaged in sophistic',⁵ and it seems that it was the status of public teacher of rhetoric that merited the appellation 'sophist'.

² See especially Bowersock *Sophists*, Anderson (1989), (1993).

³ So Anderson (1986), (1989) 82–9 and (1990), but see Swain (1991).

⁴ The classic account is Russell (1983), cf. Anderson (1993).

⁵ Galen xiv. 627 cf. Anderson (1989) 88, Swain (1991) 161.

The title 'sophist', however, was not always claimed by those eligible: Dionysius of Miletus, termed 'sophist' and *rhetor* on an honorific inscription, is simply called *rhetor* on his sarcophagus, found beside the *agora* in Ephesus in a position of extraordinary honour, as recorded by Philostratus.⁶ Some declaimed but took no pupils, like Aristides: but as Aristides found, this might disqualify a *rhetor* from the immunity from taxation and right to decline certain offices which a limited number of teachers enjoyed.⁷

The fees charged by the most eminent were sometimes high enough to make a significant contribution to the income even of men already very rich. Polemo charged Herodes Atticus 250,000 drachmae (over 40 talents) and a Bosporan king 10 talents, each for a single performance. Scopelianus of Clazomenae was paid 15 talents by Herodes Atticus' father for declaiming before his son. More modest fees such as the 100 drachmae charged for a course by Proculus of Naucratis, even when levied on as many as a hundred pupils (the number Philostratus claims for Marcus of Byzantium) cannot significantly have changed the lifestyle of a sophist who was, like many, from the propertied city élite, though we get a measure of their contribution from the story that the aristocratic Heraclides of Lycia bought a suburban property worth 10 talents out of his fee-income and called it *Rhetoric*.⁸ On the other hand, fees might be vital to the budget of a man trying to rise from the lower echelons of the educated classes, as Lucian presents himself in his *Dream*.

Economic gain was not limited to fees. The most successful might be appointed to one of the chairs of rhetoric in Athens at a salary of 10,000 drachmae, whether the city chair or, after A.D. 176, a chair founded by the emperor Marcus.⁹ Other cities must have had chairs too – almost certainly Ephesus – but we have no explicit attestation. Other honours might be accorded by cities. To men already wealthy some, like statues and privileged seating at festivals (*prohedria*), will have been more attractive than money as extra points in the constant competition for honour (*time*). A very few sophists extracted rewards of money or status from emperors. To Dionysius Hadrian gave equestrian appointments and membership of the Alexandrian Museum. To Polemo he gave membership of the Museum along with a gift of 250,000 drachmae, an extension to his descendants of the right to free use of the *cursus publicus* given him by Trajan, and generous benefactions in money and kind to his city, Smyrna.¹⁰ Many more individuals no doubt benefited financially from rich pupils or patrons.

⁶ *IEph* 3047 and 426, cf. Philostr. VS 1.22 (526).

⁷ *Dig.* xxvii.1.6.8: see Bowersock, *Sophists*, with the corrections of Griffin (1971) 279–80.

⁸ Philostr. VS 1.21 (521) (Scopelianus), 1.25 (535) (the Bosporan) and (538) (Polemo), II.27 (615) (Heraclides). ⁹ On chairs see Avotins (1975).

¹⁰ Philostr. VS 1.25.531–3: for the benefactions to Smyrna cf. *IGRR* IV 1431 = *ISmyrna* 697, and for the overall context of imperial favours Millar, *Emperor*.

Money and honour will surely have attracted some to the profession, as in Lucian's *Twice Accused* (27–31) Rhetoric says that they drew Lucian. But the other gains she lists are important, too. A declaimer clearly revelled in the power to manipulate his audience's emotions, the acclaim that punctuated and concluded his performances and the recognition they won him in society at large. There were occasions which only an outstanding speaker could be called upon to grace – the dedication of a great temple, exemplified by Antonius Polemo's commission from Hadrian to speak at the dedication at Athens of the temple of Olympian Zeus (completed after almost 700 years), or a funeral oration, such as that delivered by Aristides for his former tutor in language and literature (*grammaticus*), Alexander of Cotiaeum. Or a sophist might volunteer a speech to commemorate or lament a disaster, like Aristides' *Monodia* for Smyrna.¹¹

A sophist's involvement in the real world could spill over the bounds of epideictic rhetoric. The magisterial role arrogated by poets in archaic Greece and by dramatists in classical Athens was now played more by sophists than by any other literary figure. Many are found intervening in troubles within or between Greek cities, and to some extent they do so as experts in arguments and words. But we must remember that our documentation of such sophists' interventions comes from Philostratus, who seems to select those sophists who already enjoy family status and wealth and those incidents which epitomize their social eminence. Like many other marks of eminence – local office, benefactions to their cities, embassies to governors and emperors, senatorial marriages and imperial friendships – the mantle of peacemaker may have fallen on sophists' shoulders more in their capacity as local aristocrats than as sophists, however good a training for calming an angry mob a career of Demosthenic impersonations may have given.¹² We must remember, too, that sophists undertook real forensic cases (sometimes for a huge fee, like the two talents charged by Polemo to a Lydian) as well as arguing on either or both sides of fictitious ones.

Another attraction will have been the way that the repertoire of sophistic declamations cast declaimers as privileged interpreters of a classical world with which they and their audience were deeply and emotionally engaged. The subjects of *meletai* were drawn from Greek history between the Persian Wars and Alexander, with a few Homeric outliers. For the duration of his performance the sophist was Themistocles or Demosthenes advising the Athenians, his audience in Nicomedeia or Pergamum, Seleucia or Sidon, were fifth- or fourth-century Athenians. Part of the reason for the maintenance of this repertoire will have been precisely that it was the staple and universal educational diet: as has been said above,

¹¹ Philostr. *VS* 1.25 (533), Aristides 18 (*Monodia*) and 32 (on Alexander).

¹² See Bowie (1982).

education in the basic history and literature of the classical period provided Hellenes everywhere with a common cultural language. But in explaining this archaism some weight should be allowed to the contrast between the glorious independence of Greek cities that a Themistocles or Demosthenes were struggling to preserve and the limitations on a city's actions or city politician's power that followed from the Greek world's incorporation in the Roman empire. The archaism, after all, is not limited to the content of school syllabuses and of sophists' declamations, or even to literature, most branches of which are equally focused on the classical past and are written in an Attic dialect artificially achieved by assiduous consultation of primary authorities and of lexica.¹³ The daily world of the educated élites was one in which many buildings and institutions of the classical past – at least in mainland Greece – continued to function and might even have been restored, in which Roman styles of dress and nomenclature could be ignored, and in which the sculptures adorning private and public buildings were often copies of classical Greek originals, only occasionally Hellenistic and even less often discernibly Roman. During the first decades of the second century the wearing of beards again becomes fashionable, and a city aristocrat whose statues evoke a bearded orator or philosopher of the classical period, clad in the *himation*, will easily have seen himself in that role, whether declaiming in a *bouleuterion* or theatre or arguing real political issues in these same buildings before the *boule* or *demos*.

II. PHILOSOPHY AND PHILOSOPHICAL RHETORIC

The philosophic type that becomes increasingly popular for statues of city eminences reminds us that sophists were not the only intellectuals who claimed to interpret the classical heritage.¹⁴ The Greek philosophy of the empire is discussed fully below (chapter 32). Here it is important to note that many sophists and philosophers saw each other as rivals in the provision of tertiary education. In Athens the big schools – the Peripatos, the Stoa, and the Garden, and probably also the Academy – continued a formal organization with lectures, pupils and a scholarch in whose appointment there was sometimes imperial interest. In other cities a philosopher with an established reputation attracted pupils – the Stoics Epictetus at Nicopolis or Timocrates of Heracleia at Smyrna, the Academic Plutarch at Chaeronea. Some of these seem to have relied wholly on oral teaching. So Epictetus, whose staccato harangues, rarely approaching a formal lecture, are known to us only in the form given them by his admiring pupil Arrian; so, too, the Cynic Demonax, lauded in Lucian's biography. There is no evidence there that Demonax either wrote or gave formal lectures: we see him

¹³ For fuller documentation of this interpretation see Bowie (1970).

¹⁴ See Zanker (1995).

confuting others at their lectures, balling-out Favorinus in mutual one-upmanship, and deploying a scathing wit to castigate effeminacy, moral flabbiness and social pretension. Lucian represents him as playing the same game of repartee and enjoying the same public authority as Philostratus arrogates for his sophists.

Other philosophers may indeed have confined themselves chiefly or wholly to the production of written texts: Arrian's edition of Epictetus' harangues and a work on comets acquired him the label 'the philosopher', and Galen's philosophical thought was more diffused by books than lectures. More commonly, a serious philosopher would write books, whether treatises entitled 'About x' or dialogues, would engage in philosophical argument with small numbers of rivals, pupils, friends or patrons, and would also deliver formal lectures. Examples can be found in C. Musonius Rufus, whose Etrurian origins did not prevent him writing his philosophy in Greek; in Plutarch, who despite some apparently declamatory pieces expresses contempt for 'sophists'; or in Gellius' friend the Platonist L. Calvenus Taurus of Berytus (or, if we believe Philostratus against a Delphic inscription, Tyre). Taurus worked with sophists rather than as their rival, and is mentioned with respect by Philostratus as the philosophy teacher of Herodes Atticus.

Still closer to sophists were philosophers who gave public lectures in the sophistic manner. A clear case is that of Favorinus, the *soi-disant* eunuch from Arles, whom Philostratus puts in his small category of men who acquired the label sophist 'because they seemed to be sophists although really philosophers'.¹⁵ Some of his writings argued about central philosophical issues from an Academic position. But other works were declamations, like those known from Philostratus – *On the Boy who Died Young*, *In Support of Gladiators*, *In Support of Baths* – and Philostratus' remarks on his mien, on his rhythms and on his tone of delivery class his public performances firmly with those of sophists. So, too, as Philostratus notes, does his quarrel with the sophist Polemo, the latter supported by Smyrna while Ephesus backed Favorinus. Of his extant works a discourse on *Fortune* (= [Dio] 64) is sophistic, and a speech criticizing Corinth for considering pulling down a statue previously voted him (= [Dio] 37) is a genuine document from real life which might be delivered by either a sophist or a philosopher in a career of aggressive self-promotion. A third work, *On Exile*, of which much has been recovered on papyrus, has sometimes been thought to relate to a real exile following the same quarrel with Hadrian to which Philostratus attributes the Athenians' decision to pull down their statue of Favorinus: but it is rich in philosophical *loci communes*, and since

¹⁵ οἱ φιλοσοφῆσαντες ἐν δόξῃ τοῦ σοφιστεῦσαι, Philostr. *VS* 1.8 (492) cf. pref. (484). Favorinus, 1.8 (489–92).

Philostratus denies that Favorinus suffered as a result of the quarrel, it is more probably as fictitious in its assumptions as declamations regularly were.¹⁶

A better-documented but more complex example is that of Dio Chrysostom, claimed by Favorinus as his teacher. On the conventional view, dating back to Synesius and in essence to Dio's own self-representation, Dio started life as a sophist, composing a work *Against Philosophers* at the time of Flavian persecution of philosophers in Rome and Italy and, about the same time, two elegant speeches commemorating a boxer Melancomas, who had caught the eye of Titus before an early death. Under Domitian, Dio was himself exiled after the disgrace and execution of a relative of the emperor (there are various candidates) and during his exile converted to a brand of philosophy more Cynic than Stoic. On the usual dating of some works, philosophical features can be found early – e.g. in the *Rhodian*, perhaps a speech of the early 70s – and one view dismisses the conversion as posturing. Another view would redate works and insist that Dio did change tack under Domitian.¹⁷ What is clear, on either interpretation, is that a number of speeches mix genuine (or at least look-alike) philosophical argument with the rhetorical skills and literary charms more often associated with sophists.

It is not surprising that a man so influenced by Plato (the two books Dio took into exile were the *Phaedo* and Demosthenes' *On the False Embassy*) should see the point of exploiting literary virtuosity to propagate philosophy. Thus the four discourses *On Kingship*, whether any of them was actually delivered to Trajan as two purport to have been, entertained their audience by variation between first-person exposition (1 and 3) and framed dialogue (Philip and Alexander in 2, Alexander and Diogenes in 4); by anecdote, with which all four begin; or by snippets of purported autobiography. In 1 Dio, lost in the Alpheus valley, meets a rustic crone who prophesies his restoration from exile and then acts as the mouthpiece for the Platonic myth used by Dio to close the work, an elaboration of Prodicus' 'Choice of Heracles'. In 7 the anecdote has expanded to become the 'myth': shipwrecked on Euboea, Dio is given hospitality by country folk whose virtues are contrasted with the vice and corruption of city life. In 36 Dio recalls a visit to Borysthenes, where he was struck by the persistent attachment to Hellenic traditions of Greeks constantly embattled with barbarians: keen on Homer and Plato, they listened to a difficult discourse on the divine government of the universe, in which views of 'the philosophers' are followed and contrasted with a myth that Dio attributes to the Magi. It was a good gimmick for ensuring the attention of Dio's audience in Prusa, elsewhere both praised and criticized by Dio for the quality of its Hellenism.

¹⁶ See Swain (1989), Gleason (1994), Bowie (1997).

¹⁷ Against conversion Moles (1978), but see Sidebottom (1990).

These and other speeches which handle philosophical ideas – like 12 on Pheidias' statue of Zeus at Olympia – are in their manner, and were doubtless in their delivery, as sophistic as the frivolous *tour de force* in which Dio sets out to demonstrate that Troy never fell to the Greeks (11). We find the same mixture of philosophical thought and sophistic entertainment later in the century, under Commodus, in the elegant, allusive but shallow Maximus of Tyre, whose omission from Philostratus warns us that there may have been many others like him.

But Dio had another vein which was far from shallow or frivolous. As well as several speeches delivered in Prusa after his return from exile in A.D. 97, proposing and defending his policies for the city's enhancement, there are a few addressed to Prusa and to other Bithynian cities urging moderation in their financially disastrous rivalry for status and privileges.¹⁸ Furthermore, a long speech delivered in Rhodes and another in Alexandria (31 and 32) aim respectively to encourage good 'Hellenic' behaviour and to curb outbreaks of disorder associated particularly with theatrical entertainments. Of a pair of speeches delivered in Tarsus one seems (more enigmatically) to seek to raise standards of civic behaviour, the other to urge extension of full citizenship. Whether or not some of these belong before Dio's exile, and whether or not Dio is in any sense an emissary of the emperor, he deploys rhetorical skills laced with a modicum of philosophical thought in an apparently real world, but in a way we know also from the careers of straightforward sophists like Polemo and Aristides.¹⁹

Between the late 150s and early 180s the sophistic declamation was developed in a different direction by Lucian. Although he, too, claims conversion to philosophy, the fictitious autobiography of *Twice Prosecuted* suggests rather that he saw the literary rewards of deploying elements of Platonic dialogue and Cynic, and more specifically Menippean, satire. He trained as a sophist and for some time probably pursued a conventional career. But many of the predominantly humorous works to survive seem to have been delivered in the sophistic manner and social contexts in which sophists delivered discourses (*dialexeis*) or overtures (*prolaliai*) and declamations (*meletai*). The former sometimes draw attention to the following declamatory performance's novelty.²⁰ Some works reveal their first place of performance – the *Scythian* a city in Macedonia, *Runaway Slaves* (satirizing, as so often in Lucian, philosophers of various schools) Philippopolis in Thrace. Many assume Athens' centrality, and certainly presuppose familiarity with big names on the Athenian cultural stage – Favorinus, Herodes Atticus, Hadrian of Tyre, Pollux of Naucratis – but they are unlikely all to have had an Athenian audience.

¹⁸ Documented also by Pliny, *Ep.* x; cf. Robert (1977).

¹⁹ Marcus reconciles Megara and Athens, Philostr. *VS* 1.24 (529), Polemo heals stasis in Smyrna, *VS* 1.25 (531); cf. Aristides' speeches *On Concord*, 23 to the cities of Asia and 24 to Rhodes. For full discussions of Dio see Jones, *Dio Chrysostom*, Desideri (1978), Brancacci (1985). ²⁰ Cf. Nesselrath (1990).

But the fact that we have texts of Dio, Aristides, Maximus and Lucian should remind us that their works, aimed in the first instance at live audiences in the great sophistic centres, may have been read within their lifetime by other Greeks who may never have visited these hothouses of literary culture. There is always, of course, doubt about the relation between a live performance and the text approved for copying and circulation. We shall never know the *ipsissima verba* of a sophistic declamation. But the texts that we have were also all that most Greeks in smaller and more remote cities could rely on to discover how such stars compared with their local *rhetor*. Indeed, it has been held that many of Aristides' speeches should be reckoned, on the ground of their denseness and difficulty, to be texts for reading and not performance.²¹ We know that texts of sophists' declamations were not only conned by professionals like Philostratus and by later writers or rhetorical manuals but even percolated to the chalcenteric dwellers of Oxyrhynchus. Admittedly our two Aristides papyri are of the sixth or seventh centuries A.D., whereas papyri of Plutarch and Achilles Tatius are attested within a century of the author's lifetime, but other declamations are to be found among the second-century books from Oxyrhynchus.²²

Alongside works intended primarily for performance but then circulating as texts to be read stand others whose primary destination was a reader, even if a recitation to launch the book cannot be excluded. Address to an individual shows many of Lucian's works to be pamphlets for reading: *How One Ought to Write History*, addressed to Philo, the spoof biography of the Cynic Peregrinus to one Saturninus, and that of Alexander of Abonouteichos to Celsus. Many others read as though they, too, were pamphlets, e.g. the two-book *True Histories*. Most ingredients are found, if in different proportions, in both categories of work: the dialogue form, social satire and literary parody, fantasy of a sort justly claimed by Lucian as Aristophanic, all bound together by the sophist's skill in marshalling arguments and illustrating them with anecdote. Occasionally he unsettles his reader by relocating his satirical persona, as in his laudatory works on the philosophers Nigrinus and Demonax, although there the philosophers themselves are presented as criticizing contemporary society.

III. THE WRITTEN AND THE READ

Lucian's works take us into genres intended primarily for reading. Another of these that seems to be new and to develop in the first two centuries A.D. is the novel (or 'romance'). The extant five Greek ideal novels were probably composed (though both *termini* are controversial) between c.A.D. 50 and

²¹ W. Morel *RE* xv. 1 col. 497.

²² For later reading of Aristides, Russell (1983) 5; for his papyri see Aristides ed. Lenz-Behr 1 1 (Leiden 1976) x–xi.

A.D. 250, and quotations and papyri of over a dozen others corroborate that span. Although its roots can be traced through many Greek genres – the *Odyssey*, Euripidean melodrama, New Comedy, Hellenistic erotic poetry, historiography, declamation – and into Near Eastern story-telling, the phenomenon that we find in our fragments of the *Ninus* and in our full text of Chariton is in essence new. The basic plot can be variously handled: boy meets girl (both aristocratic), they are separated by chance, storms or pirates, dragged round much of the eastern Mediterranean, and reunited after surviving several attempts on their life and chastity.

Mannered style and Atticist language suggest that Achilles, Longus and Heliodorus of Emesa may have been practising sophists (an idea precariously endorsed for the first two by ancient sources). Chariton, less mannered and hardly Atticizing, is at least a sophistic hanger-on if, as he claims, he was secretary to the *rhetor* Athenagoras of Aphrodisias. Some features of content also show especial affinities with sophistic: delight in ecphrasis, declamatory monologues, contrived trial scenes. Others, however, recur in contemporary but not specifically sophistic works – scientific excursus (chiefly in Achilles and Heliodorus, with traces in Longus),²³ paradoxography, and constant allusion to classical Greek literature. The novel should therefore be seen as a sibling and not a child of the sophistic movement. It catered to some of the same needs or tastes. A reader could enjoy identification with a handsome hero or heroine whom Fortune saw right in the end, just as a member of a declaimer's audience could, with the speaker himself, become Demosthenes or Alexander for an hour. Both suspended the humdrum present – but in different ways. Whereas the sophist added a dimension of fantasy to the individual's public and political life, the novelist brought it to his personal and sexual experience.

There may have been weaknesses in the social structures of the age that explain at once the attraction of the novelistic hero, rift from his community, and the pursuit of personal salvation in contemporary philosophy and religion.²⁴ But other explanations offer. The formula, once hit upon, was a winner – who is to say it would not have been developed so enthusiastically if discovered three centuries earlier? For the archaic period the *Odyssey* had offered similar excitement: but although still well known, it was chiefly as a school text with which familiarity might be assumed and paraded (as by so many writers of this period) and its world must have seemed more distant than would that conjured up in novelistic prose, often close, in starting-point at least, to that of readers in Greek cities.

It is debated who these readers were. Some seek them lower down the educational scale than those of high literature – even, for the supposedly pre-sophistic *Ninus*, Chariton and Xenophon, among women and children. One argument, the scarcity of references to novels or novelists in

²³ Rommel (1923). ²⁴ Reardon (1969).

'respectable' literature, has been exaggerated and does not compel this conclusion; and the constant allusion to classical texts, even in Chariton, suggests that novelists at least expected a well-educated audience.²⁵

But a new literary form naturally evaded the classifications of Hellenistic literary theory and the prescriptions of rhetorical handbooks, and we know of no attempt to give it a theoretical framework. That had advantages. Variants could diverge strikingly from what seems to have been the norm. The miniature effects of Longus' four books in which his rustic adolescents rarely leave their flocks, and never leave Lesbos, play on readers' expectation of a pan-Mediterranean stage and eight or ten books of narrative. It seems that it was Lucian who, characteristically, and perhaps independently of the Latin comic novel of Petronius, wrote a burlesque with a first-person narrator turning into an ass and experiencing adventures and sexual encounters where the scabrous and deviant replaced the romantic and titillating.

So much for the major genres wholly or in some degree new. Others could be added of less significance, like the prose hymns of Aristides²⁶ or the recreation of classical Attic town and country in the fictitious letters of Aelian and Alciphron. But the major genres of the archaic and classical period were not dead. Alongside prolific philosophical writing, noticed only tangentially above and more fully in chapter 32, and oratory that in its sophistic colours has so high a profile, histories continued to be written. It is a symptom of imperial Greeks' preoccupation with their classical past that much historiography was a reworking, often in elegant Atticist idiom, of earlier writers' accounts. But not all was of this sort, and many works tackle recent history, others by their shape or approach reflected the contemporary reality of a Roman empire in which the governing class was still preponderantly drawn from Latin-speaking Rome and Italy.

The work of Arrian of Nicomedeia exemplifies all three types. His *Anabasis of Alexander*, claimed in its second preface as his masterpiece (and, some would infer, written after his distinguished Roman senatorial career and retirement to Athens) works solely from written sources. However judicious his choice of Ptolemy and Aristobulus as chief witnesses or his occasional supplement from other traditions, his activity was more compilation than research, and at times he may have written what his own autopsy could have refuted.²⁷ Seven-book format and title evoked his role-model Xenophon, whose *Anabasis* was a suitable paradigm for would-be-sober military history. Equally derivative were its one-book supplement, the *Indike*, whose more ethnographic content induced Arrian to attempt to write it in Ionic, and his ten-book history of Alexander's successors.

²⁵ Perry (1967) suggested women and children, Hägg (1983) still allows the latter. *Contra* Wesseling (1988), Bowie (1994), (1996). ²⁶ Russell (1990b) 199–219.

²⁷ On career and works most concisely Bosworth (1980) 1–38, more fully Stadter (1980).

The contemporary world, however, came closer in his *Parthian History*, apparently skewed towards narration of Trajan's campaigns. War had been the privileged topic of history since Herodotus and Thucydides, and it was now only of Rome's wars that an imperial Greek might write contemporary history of that traditional sort. Many frontier wars probably generated Greek histories, but only occasionally do we hear of them. Statilius Crito, doctor to Trajan, wrote a *Getica* on his Dacian Wars. A whole clutch of historians was hatched by the Parthian campaigns of Verus to be mocked – and in some cases perhaps invented – by Lucian in his essay *How to Write History*. The Danube campaigns of Commodus figure in Herodian's history of the period from the death of Marcus in A.D. 180 to the accession of Gordian III in A.D. 238.

But Herodian's work offers another type of history that could now be written in Greek, mixing fourth- with fifth-century models, a Roman political history in which the imperial throne stood at the centre. To be kinetic and involve war and politics a period of civil strife must be chosen. We know from Josephus²⁸ of Greek histories of A.D. 68–70, while the wars that threw up and followed the Severi offered Herodian an attractive theme which he could represent as Thucydidean. He is often criticized for reinforcing his autopsy by too little research and too much sophistic décor, and many moderns prefer the section of Dio's work on the wars that brought Septimius Severus to power.

That work, a history of Rome to the year of Dio's own second consulate, A.D. 229, illustrates yet another path that could be taken. Whereas Diodorus of Agrigium and Nicolaus of Damascus, writing under the triumvirs and Augustus, might have seemed to set limits to the freshly established world empire of Rome by placing it in the context of a world history, the second and third centuries see universal giving way to Roman history, history written by Greeks often holding high Roman office.

Appian, a practising lawyer from Alexandria, also exemplified this type, with prologue (perhaps written c. A.D. 160) and many books extant. The first three covered the regal period, expansion into Italy and the Samnite wars. The remaining first twelve books then treated chronologically the annexation of successive provinces, a pattern broken for monographs on the Hannibalic and Mithridatic wars. Books 13–17 narrated the civil wars culminating in Augustus, 18–21 were devoted to Egypt. Book 22 seems to have swept from Augustus to Trajan, with 23 on Dacia and 24 on Arabia. Appian's emphases are predictable. The provincial books focus on conquest and resistance, the turbulent century from 133 B.C. receives especial emphasis, and his own province, Egypt, is privileged by four books, which may have admitted more social and administrative history than most of the

²⁸ *BJ* IV.496.

work. Trajan's campaigns get special attention: then, with Hadrian's accession and the Antonine peace, history stops.

We do not know how the problem of the imperial peace was solved by Marcus' freedman Chryseros in his history of Rome, apparently down to his own time, or by the Greek and Italian History of A. Claudius Charax of Pergamum (*cos.* A.D. 147). They may have been saved by Marcus' wars.²⁹ It is perhaps significant in the case of Dio from Bithynian Nicaea that it was only after his monograph on the rise of the Severi that he turned to the arduous task (ten years of research and twelve of writing) of an eighty-book history. Dio gave space to administration as well as war, and it is regrettable that though we have Books 36–54, Books 55–60 and 79–80 survive only in fragments (albeit substantial for Books 79–80) and most of his imperial books (61–78) are known only in epitome.

This imperial section tends to the biographic, and reminds us that imperial biography was another available genre. We know of many, and there must have been scores more, ranging from the serious to the tendentious (whether in praise or blame). Domitian's reputation had him paired with Dionysius of Syracuse by Amyntianus, writing under Marcus. Hadrian's popularity in the Greek world secured him several, some doubtless in his lifetime. Even the reign of Pius had its historians,³⁰ though it is hard to know what they chronicled. The sophist Antipater was also, presumably, complimentary in his *historia* of the emperor Severus who made him *ab epistulis*.³¹

Amyntianus' other known works take us back towards Arrian's *Anabasis*. Like Arrian (and several imperial Greeks before them – Potamon of Mytilene, Dio Chrysostom and Plutarch) he wrote a work on Alexander, but also another pair of *Lives* linking Philip and Augustus, and a work on Olympias.³² His fourth-century interest matches declaimers' focus on the pre-Hellenistic period. The same bias affected the world history of the Hadrianic Cephalion, ending with Alexander, just as the Greek history of Jason of Argos, probably of this period, ended with Athens' fall in 322 B.C. Moreover, works on the Hellenistic period must have had a Greek rather than Roman focus – Telephus of Pergamum's five books *On the Pergamene Kings*, Criton of Pieria's work *On the Empire of the Macedonians*.

A similar recreation of a world in which Greece has pride of place could be achieved by writing local history, often antiquarian and periegetic. The same Telephus wrote a *Periegesis of Pergamum* – though his work *On the Temple of Augustus at Pergamum* suggests admission of recent monuments – Criton a *Periegesis of Syracuse*. There may have been more history in his *Palleniaka* or *Sikelika*, as there seems to have been in the work of Arrian that falls in this

²⁹ See Bowie (1974) = Bowie (1970) 12–13; on Charax, Andrei (1984).

³⁰ Paus. VIII.43. ³¹ Philostr. *VS* II.24 (607).

³² Phot. *Bibl.* 131, 97a 9 ff. For these and other works on Alexander see *FGrH* 147–151.

category, his Bithynian history, ending with his country's annexation by Rome, a terminus that recognized the real world in which Arrian had his career. There were numerous works similarly entitled by local *pepaideumenoí*, often *rhētores*, and others called *Foundations/ktiseis* and specifically directed towards the early, often mythical period: thus again Criton with his *Foundation of Syracuse*. As Criton's two-centre productions show, a writer might seek or reciprocate honour from another region as well as his *patria*. P. Anteius Antiochus, the mid-second century sophist from Aegeae, not only wrote *peri tes patriδος* but established mythical links with Argos (through Perseus) which were officially recognized.³³ All these works are lost, but the manner in which such writing recreated the past can be followed step by step in Pausanias' *Periegesis* – great names and events, legendary and historical, are celebrated in connection with monuments still visited by the second-century tourist; and again, as in declamation and much historiography, material later than the Roman conquest of Greece is neglected.³⁴

One branch alone of this type of writing invited contemporary material, works like Aspasius of Tyre's *On Tyre and its Citizens*, Timogenes' similar work on Heracleia Pontica in three books, or the more comprehensive thirty books of Herennius Philo's *On Cities and their Famous Men*. Focus on distinguished men, as on monuments, might stress continuity and the vigour of contemporary Greek culture. So, too, purely biographic works – Lucian's pamphlet-sized *Demonax* and *Nigrinus*, and doubtless the lost biography of Arrian by Dio. In the hands of Philostratus a sequence of sophistic biographies becomes philhellenic cultural history, as do his novelistic eight books on the guru Apollonius of Tyana.

We have already crossed the boundary that we, but not contemporaries, might draw between history and its neighbours, biography, mythography and philological scholarship, and the addition of the sciences forms a nexus between whose members Greek writers moved more readily than moderns. Some were superficial, aiming to entertain by piquant selection and juxtaposition like the sophist Aelian of Praeneste in his *History of Animals* and *Diverse History*, or impress by sheer accumulation of material, like that on the history of eating and drinking in Athenaeus of Naucratis' *Sophists at Table*. But sometimes range may reflect breadth of serious learning, as probably in another writer of local history, Hermogenes of Smyrna. He wrote a two-volume study of Smyrna, several *ktiseis* (four on cities in Europe, two on Asia, one on the islands), a book on Homer's birthplace and another on his wisdom (*sophia*). But his main effort must have gone into his seventy-seven medical works.³⁵ This range outclasses even Favorinus,

³³ *FGH* 747. ³⁴ See Habicht (1985), Bingen (1996), Arafat (1996).

³⁵ *FGH* 579, *IGRR* IV 3311 = *ISmyrna* 536.

who alongside the philosophical and sophistic works already noted wrote a twenty-four-volume *Pantodape Historia* in which all manner of learning was on view but (unlike his arch-enemy Polemo, who wrote a *Physiognomica*) had no medical string to his bow. But both are dwarfed by the achievement of Plutarch and Galen.

Plutarch has already been mentioned for his philosophy. There his works range from highly technical essays in metaphysics and logic like *On the Principle of Cold* (addressed to Favorinus) and *On Stoic Inconsistencies* to protreptic moral treatises on such subjects as friendship, anger or flattery. But what we call the *Moralia* also include some rhetorical pieces (e.g. *On the Luck of the Romans*, *On the Luck of Alexander*, or the lost *Speech Delivered to Dio in Olympia*, presumably in reply to Dio 12), and religious and antiquarian studies (there was, inevitably, a work on *Ktiseis*). To these interests the lost works known from the Lamprias catalogue added philological scholarship, evident also in such extant pieces as *Greek, Roman and Sympotic Questions*. The humanity and range that the *Moralia* exemplify are also manifest in the parallel *Lives*. Although dedicated, like *Sympotic Questions*, to the philhellene Roman Sosius Senecio, the *Lives* surely expected a readership more Greek than western, and their programme was intended as much to recall to Greeks the achievements of great men of the past many, but not all, of whom were national 'heroes', as inform them about comparable figures in the history of the ruling power. The principle of pairing Greek and Roman lives, though not new, was increasingly appropriate in an age when more and more Greeks (among them Plutarch and others in his circle) were involved at high levels in Roman administration, and when in some spheres and locations (Rome, Athens, Pergamum, Ephesus) a common Greek and Latin intellectual and literary culture was developing.

Even greater was Galen, whose career as a practising and teaching doctor found room for writing works over an astonishing range, listed in a work he composed himself late in life when he discovered doubt about his authorship of books on sale in Rome. Over 120 survive, chiefly medical and philosophical, but those lost also embraced literary criticism and scholarship.

One other Antonine figure was also a major thinker, though we tend to class his writing, like Galen's medical works, as non-literary in a way that Platonic and protreptic traditions deter us from categorizing philosophy. That is Claudius Ptolemaeus, most famous as a mathematician, astronomer and geographer, though he wrote too on astrology, harmonics and optics. By contrast, we dismiss the content of Artemidorus' *Interpretation of Dreams*, though welcoming it as evidence for the perspectives and preoccupations of the age, the same criterion that admits to bookshelves Aelius Aristides' curious hypochondriac diary *Sacred Tales*.

IV. POETRY

Many of these subjects were also popularized in didactic poetry, usually, following the Hesiodic tradition, in dactylic hexameters.³⁶ Dorotheus of Sidon's long astronomical poem, surviving only in Arabic, was written about A.D. 80, the year of birth of the author claiming the name Manetho of whose *apotelesmatika* six books (c.2,000 lines) are extant. Galen quotes a 174-line elegiac poem on antidotes to snake-bites dedicated to Nero by his doctor Andromachus. Marcellus of Side, later chosen by Herodes to compose poems respectively heroizing Regilla and protecting her estate on the Via Appia, had his forty-book medical work *Chironides* lodged in Rome's libraries by Hadrian and Pius. In Lycian Rhodiapolis Heraclitus, priest of Asclepius and Hygieia, both dedicated them a temple and was honoured as the Homer of medical poetry and 'the first in all history to be a doctor, a historian and a poet of medical and philosophical verse'. He gave copies of his works to Alexandria, Rhodes and Athens (where he was honoured by the Garden and Areopagus). Enhancement rather than preservation of human life engendered three books on *Bird-catching* from a Dionysius (extant in prose paraphrase), five books on fishing, dedicated by a Cilician ('Oppian') to Marcus and Commodus and four on hunting dedicated to Caracalla. In geography, a *Periegesis of the Whole World* in 1,186 hexameters uses acrostics to identify its author as Dionysius of Alexandria and its date as Hadrianic: it became a basic school text, translated twice into Latin in late antiquity and used down to the early modern period.

Hexameters' other main genre, narrative epic, could also bring renown and reward, not least if the emperor was its theme.³⁷ Pancrates from Egypt won membership of the Alexandrian Museum for his poem on a hunt in which Hadrian slew a lion attacking Antinous: some uninspired lines survive. Nestor of Laranda's *Alexandrias* doubtless praised Alexander Severus. But less such poetry is attested than might be expected, and traditional myth remains the favoured subject. It may be for such works as his *Metamorphoses* (commended by Menander *rhetor*) and *Ilias Lipogrammatos* (each book eschewed successive letters of the alphabet) that Nestor was honoured by statues in Cyzicus, Ephesus, Ostia and Paphos. Certainly the mythological epic diminishes neither in frequency nor size. The Domitianic sophist Scopelianus of Clazomenae wrote a *Gigantias*; scraps of another (once at least seventeen books) seem to belong, like a *Bassarica* in at least fourteen books, to a Dionysius, perhaps even the Periegete, certainly of his period. Quintus of Smyrna's fourteen-book *Posthomerica*, from the mid-third century, the only epic between Apollonius and Nonnus to survive intact, was modest in scale alongside the sixty-book *Unions of Gods and*

³⁶ On these poets see Bowie (1990) 66–79.

³⁷ On these poets see further Bowie (1990) 79–83.

Heroes by Nestor's son Peisander. Such works doubtless satisfied the appetite for legends attached to the many Greek cities through which their readership spread, as is shown by the much later work to which they can be seen to lead up, the *Dionysiaca* of Nonnus of Panopolis in forty-eight books. Less favoured, it seems, were short epics in the Callimachean mode that influenced didactic writers, but one survives from the latter half of the third century, Triphiodorus' *Capture of Troy*.

The boundary between such book-texts and the world of performance and public display is straddled by epigram. Mostly in elegiacs, these could be sepulchral, dedicatory or commemorative, inscribed upon statue bases, buildings and grave monuments – or, in the unusual case of the many verses recording tourists' visits to the singing statue of Memnon near Egyptian Thebes, upon the legs of the colossus. A group of these emanates from one of the few women writers of this or any period, Iulia Balbilla, who opted to compose her elegiacs in Sapphic dialect. Expanded, such poems could become the hymnic and curse texts by Marcellus from the estate of Regilla or the eighteen elegiac lines from Pergamum in which, towards 180, Aristides acknowledges Asclepius' aid.³⁸ Often the composers were amateurs or hacks. But often too we have professional work of high quality, like Marcellus' poems, or a group of substantial poems from Eleusis in which T. Flavius Glaucus, poet, *rhetor* and philosopher, commemorates several of his family who officiated in the cult.

The other branch of epigram, the literary, was more under professional sway, though here, too, any man of letters, even an emperor, might try his hand. Composition of epitaphs for people long dead or fictitious, of piquant dedications, and of descriptions of works of art was an epigrammatic tradition dating at least to the Hellenistic period. This was continued, and the erotic epigram enjoyed a revival, chiefly in the hands of Rufinus late in the first century and of the pederastic Strato of Sardis under Hadrian. Equally popular was the satirical epigram, where the big names (confusingly for ascriptions) are Lucillius under Nero and Lucian the prose satirist. A literary epigram might receive its first hearing in a salon or symposium, but its chief avenue of dissemination was in a written text, whether alone or in a small collection, like Strato's single volume *Musa Puerilis* or Philo of Byblos' four books. Thence it might move into an anthology, like Philip's *c.* A.D. 40 or 60 or Diogenianus' under Hadrian or Pius.

For other genres live performance was indeed the primary objective. New hymns were composed for shrines and festivals. Aristides composed a number in lyric metres in the decade following his collapse in Rome in A.D. 144, chiefly to Apollo and Asclepius, for singing by a choir of boys, probably in the small theatre in the Pergamene Asclepieion. Glaucus

³⁸ See Bowie (1990) 53–66 and (1989a) 218–20.

composed one for Olympia.³⁹ The pagan hymns we know from quotation by Christian writers (who of course had their own) and papyri (particularly magical papyri) are directed to a wide range of deities and mostly composed in hexameters, though some are in iambic trimeters or anapaests.

Particular types of hymn were the subjects of competition in *mousikoi agones*. Athens still had dithyrambic competitions: that of A.D. 97 was won by Plutarch's friend and Glaucus' ancestor Serapion, a victory that is the setting of Plutarch's *Sympotic Questions* 1 10. The Mouseia at Thespieae had a category *prosodion*, once won by an Athenian Antiphon who was also an epigrammatist and both poet and actor of New Comedy.⁴⁰ At its second-century peak it had many other slots for poetry: poem to the emperor, poem to the Muses, rhapsode, poet of New Comedy, poet of New Tragedy, singer of new songs (?), writer of satyr plays.

There were still dramatic competitions at Athens too, and schedules of prizes for contests at Aphrodisias add further categories and throw light on their relative esteem. In competitions both musical and athletic a poet (type unspecified, but since he follows an encomiographer he too may be encomiastic) wins 200 denarii; a boy citharode wins 150, an adult 500, the same prize as for tragic poets, while a comic poet gets 400 (adult athletes get 1,000 or 1,500).⁴¹ Another raises the stakes for citharodes with 3,250 denarii for the winner and 1,000 for the runner-up, and has an entry for Latin poets. A third has first, second and third prizes for tragic and comic poets (ranging from 2,700 to 600 denarii, and from 1,600 to 300 respectively). In a fourth, prizes of 1,500 for a citharode and 400 for runner-up are the only literary ones to survive. Another solely musical competition, the Lysimacheia,⁴² offers 750 denarii each to encomiographer, poet and boy citharode. As well as prizes for tragic chorus and comic and tragic poets there were prizes (for producers?) of New Comedy and New Tragedy. The same relative esteem is attested by the more modest prizes established in Oenoanda by C. Iulius Demosthenes and sanctioned by Hadrian on 29 August 125 – 75 denarii for encomiographers and poets, 200 for comic and 250 for tragic poets, 300 for the citharode (half for runners-up).

The monuments of Athens, Thespieae, Aphrodisias and Oenoanda thus yield a different and perhaps more representative view of contemporary poetic activity than the perusal of surviving texts. Few scraps of tragedy survive – though we know Nicetas and Scopelianus to have excelled as tragedians – and no comedy (unless we count Lucian's parodic tragedy *Gout*).⁴³ Yet dramatic composition manifestly continued and was esteemed. Much must have been composed, as all was performed, by professionals who were members of the World Synod of Dionysiac artists. Such a pro-

³⁹ See Bowie (1989a) 214–20, 240–1. ⁴⁰ *IG* vii 1773 cf. Bowie (1990) 58–9.

⁴¹ *CIG* 2758a; cf. Roueché (1993) Appendix 1.

⁴² *CIG* 2759 = Le Bas–Waddington 1620d = Pickard–Cambridge (1968) 321 no. 16b.

⁴³ See Bowie (1989a) 254.

fessional was C. Iulius Longianus of Aphrodisias, honoured in A.D. 127 at Halicarnassus, at least partly for excellence in tragedy, with citizenship and twenty statues, one to be set up next to that of 'old Herodotus'. He was commended for 'diverse displays [*epideixeis*] of every sort of poetry' which entertained the old and improved the young – hence it was also decided that his books should be lodged in the libraries so that the young might learn from them as from the classics.⁴⁴ Like sophists and philosophers, live poets were clearly esteemed as educators, especially in morals, in the same way as classical poets. It is also likely, as is certain for the Hellenistic period, that the theme of poet as of prose encomiographer would be the city or festival itself, perhaps with special attention to *ktisis* and early history: at Thespiae the tension between tradition and contemporary reality is resolved by establishing compositions both on the Muses and on the emperor.⁴⁵ One further feature of poetic *epideixis* assimilates it to that of sophists, and that is admiration for extempore performance, specifically lauded in an Athenian decree honouring Q. Pompeius Capito of Pergamum with a statue and citizenship.⁴⁶

The competitions also reveal the most esteemed professional poetry as citharodia, songs accompanied by the cithara. A few survive by one of the leading citharodes, Mesomedes, some even with musical notation. Hadrian awarded his freedman Mesomedes a salary (later halved by Pius), and his songs were still admired by Caracalla. His song on Antinous is lost, but a stone from Courion has given us a citharodic lament for Antinous in the metres Mesomedes favoured.⁴⁷ Music will have been more important than words in this genre, but for many Greeks citharodia – like the other purely musical performances attested at competitive festivals and the sub-literary genres of mime and pantomimes – must have offered less demanding and more pleasurable entertainment than the more morally beneficial performances of sophists and texts of high literature.

V. THE LATIN WORLD

The Latin literary world presents a fundamentally different picture from the Greek, and at least part of the explanation may be found in the different place in it of sophistic rhetoric.

First, a brief overview of what was being written. Between the end of Nero's reign and the beginning of that of Pius, volume, variety and indeed quality are impressive. Flavian epic poetry – the *Argonautica* of Valerius Flaccus, the *Bellum Punicum* of Silius Italicus, the *Thebais* and uncompleted *Achilleis* of Statius – is now being re-evaluated by modern critical scholarship, as are Statius' occasional and commemorative pieces, gathered in his

⁴⁴ *MAMA* VIII 418 (a) and (b): see further Bowie (1989b) 202.

⁴⁵ See Hardie (1983) 17 ff.

⁴⁶ *IG* III 769 (first century A.D.)

⁴⁷ See Bowie (1990).

Silvae. The *Epigrams* of Martial, chiefly satirical, marry accomplished technique to a sharp eye. Their tone, techniques and period of production (late Domitianic and early Trajanic) overlap with those of Rome's greatest verse satirist, Juvenal, perhaps still writing in the 120s. Other poetic activity there certainly was: Juvenal attests epic (the *Theseis* of Cordus), Tacitus' *Dialogue on Orators* and Pliny's *Letters* (A.D. 98–110) are witnesses to tragedies and lyric poems, some admittedly in Greek, others in Latin but probably (like Statius' *Silvae*) owing more to Greek than Latin traditions. Surviving fragments of Hadrian's poetry show us that the fashion for short poems in a variety of metres persisted.

Pliny's *Letters* themselves – 'real' yet artistically elaborated and tendentiously selected and selective – are an interesting development of those of Cicero. Two other great Latin prose genres still flourished. Tacitus and Pliny were without doubt fine orators, even if the former explores the idea of oratory's decline in his *Dialogue on Orators* and our only example of oratory to survive intact, the latter's *Panegyric* on Trajan (A.D. 98) strikes moderns as turgid and assentatory. But Tacitus' *Histories* and *Annals*, published in the first decades of the second century, are acknowledged masterpieces. Few would concede that Annius Florus' *History of Rome* raised his or historiography's reputation, but in a neighbouring genre Suetonius' *Lives of the Caesars* is a worthwhile contribution to biography.

From about A.D. 140 our record becomes much thinner. Historians and imperial biographers (the genres converge) must have written in Latin as they did in Greek, especially when incited by great foreign wars – Verus' in the East or Marcus' on the Danube – but they have left little trace. Suetonius had at least one successor early in the third century, Marius Maximus, who wrote twelve more imperial *Lives*, but he too is lost. We have scant remains of occasional poetry, including some bucolic from Annius Florus and Septimius Serenus.

Instead our three great witnesses to Latin writing under Pius and Marcus have left us respectively epistolography, *belles lettres* and an impressive range extending from Platonic philosophy to a picaresque novel. The letters are those of M. Claudius Fronto, tutor to Marcus and a distinguished orator, from whom we also have fragments of speeches, and of a theoretical work on historiography. The *belles lettres* are the *Attic Nights* of his admirer Aulus Gellius, a record of conversations, some in Rome but most in Athens, on topics philosophical, literary and above all linguistic. The third figure, Apuleius of Madaurus in Africa Proconsularis, is the only figure of all those so far mentioned to resemble Philostratus' Greek sophists. His philosophical writings (e.g. *On the Daemon of Socrates*, *On Plato*) establish him as a Platonic philosopher, somewhat more serious than Maximus of Tyre but not so professional as Plutarch. His status as a philosopher is robustly vindicated in his defence against a charge of magic purporting to be delivered

before the provincial governor Claudius Maximus (probably in A.D. 158/9). Besides revealing that he dabbled in poetry as well as magic this *Speech of Defence* also shows that his public role as a philosopher was that of itinerant lecturer rather than established teacher. That his public displays extended to sophistic themes is demonstrated by a collection of declamatory pieces, apparently short selections from a longer collection of speeches, entitled *Florida*. Finally, and most influentially, his eleven-book novel, probably entitled *Metamorphoses* but known to Augustine as *The Golden Ass*, elaborated a Greek original of the same title, very probably written by Lucian in a frivolous mode blending Menippean satire and Milesian tales, and concluded it with an Isiac revelation to the hero Lucius in an unexpected eleventh book that may or may not give it a serious religious twist.

The *Metamorphoses* may have been written as late as the 170s. Thereafter, even if Christian Latin writing flourishes, as it had already begun to with Tertullian, the traditional pagan genres almost disappear until the fourth century – and this during a period for several decades of which many Greek genres continued to show vigour.

A comprehensive explanation of this profile, so different from that in the Greek world over this period, cannot be attempted in this chapter. What is here addressed is the relation of this Latin literature to the Greek Second Sophistic. The most obvious and perhaps important single difference between this Latin and the Greek literary world is the almost complete invisibility of sophistic rhetoric. Apuleius of Madaurus apart, neither our surviving literary texts nor our epigraphic record, whether from Rome or from other cities of the Latin West, attest public declamations by rhetors before large audiences. It is especially striking that nothing in our considerable evidence on Fronto suggests that he ever declaimed, although he was a practising orator, a teacher of rhetoric and a man whose interests and personal relations brought him into close contact with many Greek representatives of the Second Sophistic.⁴⁸ Declamation was certainly practised, as the *Controversiae* and *Suasoriae* of the elder Seneca already make clear under Augustus and Tiberius, and as the minor *Declamations* ascribed to Quintilian exemplify, but its primary purpose remained educational – a teacher declaiming as a model, pupils declaiming for a teacher to criticize.

Indeed, as far as education goes, the Latin world enjoyed a structure almost indistinguishable from the Greek, with teachers of rhetoric accorded privileges in *coloniae* and *municipia* and an imperially salaried chair of rhetoric in Rome itself, founded by Vespasian and first held by no less a figure than Quintilian. It is clear too that young men who had been trained in Latin rhetoric and had also very commonly a Greek education might

⁴⁸ Champlin, *Fronto*.

then study Greek rhetoric either in Rome itself or by travelling to a Greek sophistic centre – both patterns were established even by Cicero's time. We also know that Cicero, Hirtius and Pansa declaimed when the latter were already consuls, chiefly (it seems) for each other's benefit, and doubtless so that the two consuls might learn from the maestro's virtuosity.⁴⁹ By the Augustan age it is clear that some Latin teachers of rhetoric are declaiming for entertainment and to substantial audiences,⁵⁰ and that eminent Romans, including Augustus himself, declaim before smaller groups of friends.

Our evidence becomes patchy after the period covered by the elder Seneca. It suggests, however, that at the most this pattern persists – e.g. the teacher of rhetoric Antonius Iulianus has declaimed in some public context recalled by Aulus Gellius (xv. 9) – but that Latin declamation did not become so prominent a cultural phenomenon as did Greek sophistic rhetoric, and may even have declined. The combination of teaching and declamation does not attract members of the highest social classes, as it does in the Greek world; declamation for entertainment never climbs to the top of the cultural ladder.

Accordingly, despite the interest and connoisseurship in Greek rhetoric manifested in the enthusiasm shown for Greek sophists visiting Rome (we may recall Pliny's remarks on Isaeus)⁵¹ and presumably nourished by resident Greek sophists, including the incumbent of the imperial Greek chair in the capital, Apuleius is our only clear example from this period of declamation in Latin for the entertainment of large audiences rather than for education or for the entertainment of a circle of friends. Admittedly, there are hints in the declamations of the *Florida* that Apuleius is in competition with others of his kind.⁵² It may be that we are dealing with an unusual case of the problem of invisibility, and that at least in Africa there developed a fashion for Latin declamation similar to that so widely diffused in the Greek world. It is less easy to believe that this was also true of Rome, given the silence of Pliny, Fronto and Gellius; and as for other western provinces, it may be telling that Favorinus of Arelate chose to make his sophistic, like his philosophical, career in the medium of Greek. Africa, then, may have been marked out by a local fashion – whether encouraged by the proximity of the Greek cities of Cyrenaica (Carthage itself was clearly hospitable to Greek culture) or for some other irrecoverable reason. More radically, we might note that Apuleius' allusions to competitors seem to relate specifically to the praise of proconsuls;⁵³ or might speculate that they are merely generic posturing, taken over with the other trappings of the Greek vogue. Apuleius would then become a creative borrower from Greek in his rhetorical practice as in his writing of prose fiction. A man who was

⁴⁹ Sen. *Controv.* 1 *pref.* 11; see the discussions of Winterbottom (1975) vii–xv; Sussman (1978) 1–17.

⁵⁰ Sen. *Controv.* 7 *pref.* 8. ⁵¹ *Ep.* 11.3. ⁵² *Flor.* 9; cf. Sandy (1997), Harrison (2000).

⁵³ *Flor.* 9.1, 17.1.

educated in Athens and who, like Dio and Favorinus, gave public lectures on philosophical subjects (but unlike these, in Latin) would find it easy to bridge the short gap between these and the school-oriented declamations and to attempt to transplant the developed sophistic performance.

The mere survival of a text of his *Florida* is perhaps inadequate evidence that he succeeded. It remains intriguing that no Latin equivalent of Philostratus' sophists developed – this despite close personal contacts enjoyed by Latin writers with Greek sophists (as well as with the philosophers, grammarians and medical writers with whom these sophists interacted); despite the archaizing prominent in second-century Latin, and especially in Fronto and Gellius, that must reflect some degree of influence exercised by the admittedly very different Greek preoccupation with their past; and despite the delight in linguistic niceties and in scholarly investigation in general that Fronto and Gellius share with contemporary Greek sophists. Perhaps the Greek sophistic performance became so widely admired in East and West alike that it stunted the comparable growth of the Latin. But the different relation between culture and politics might also offer an explanation. The élite of Rome and of western cities had no doubts about their role as a governing class. Fronto delivered speeches in the Senate and in the courts of Rome and attained the consulate; his pupils included the emperor Marcus; like others from western provinces who rose to high office in Rome he identified himself fully as a Roman and as an heir to the Roman past. In the Greek world, however, one reason for the prevalence of sophistic declamation, often by members of a city's élite, was its role as a substitute for 'real' uses of oratory that acquired or displayed political power.⁵⁴ The absence of sophistic declamation by members of the élites of the Latin West (like the apparent dearth of sophists from the anomalous city of Alexandria *ad Aegyptum*) becomes much less puzzling if that function is conceded to Greek sophistic.

⁵⁴ See Bowie (1970) – not, of course, a thesis that has gone unchallenged. For important recent reassessments, see Swain (1996), Schmitz (1997).

CHAPTER 32

PHILOSOPHY*

J. M. DILLON

I. INTRODUCTION

Trends in philosophy are not readily circumscribable by historical periods, and, especially since no attention was paid to philosophy in volume x, it will not be out of place to begin our story somewhat earlier, at least in a summary fashion.

In fact, a more significant starting-point may be seen in the earlier half of the first century B.C., or, to be specific, in 88 B.C., the year in which Mithridates captured Athens, which in turn resulted in Sulla's recapture of the city in 86, with its attendant destruction of both the Platonic School in the Academy and the Peripatetic School in the Lyceum, and the consequent scattering of philosophers in the directions of Rome and Alexandria. This event need not by itself have provoked changes of direction in philosophy (and indeed, in the case of the Platonic School, a change had been brewing

* The chief ancient sources for our period are as follows (those available in a Loeb Classical Library edition indicated by (L)):

Sextus Empiricus, *Works* (L); Cicero, *Philosophical Works* (L); Philo Judaeus, *Works* (L); Plutarch, *Moralia* (L); Seneca, *Moral Essays and Letters* (L); Epictetus, *Discourses* (L); Marcus Aurelius, *Meditations* (L); Eusebius, *Praeparatio Evangelica* (for fragments of Atticus, Numenius and Aristocles – fr. of Atticus collected in a Budé edition by E. des Places, Paris, 1977; fr. of Numenius likewise by E. des Places, Paris, 1973); Apuleius, *De Platone et eius dogmate* and *De Genio Socratis*, ed. J. Beaujeu, Budé: Paris, 1973; Diogenes of Oenoanda, *Fragments*, ed. C. W. Chilton, Oxford, 1971; Posidonius, *Volume I: The Fragments*, ed. L. Edelstein and I. G. Kidd, Cambridge, 1972 (2nd edn 1988), *Volumes II and III: The Commentary*, ed. I. G. Kidd, Cambridge, 1988; *Doxographi Graeci*, ed. H. Diels, Berlin, 1879 (repr. 1965).

The *Anonymous Theaetetus Commentary* is edited by Diels and Schubart, in *Berliner Klassikertexte* 2, Berlin, 1905. For Galen we are still largely dependent on the complete edition of C. G. Kühn, *Claudii Galeni Opera Omnia*, Leipzig, 1821–33, but there is a good edition of the *De Placitis Hippocratis et Platonis* by Ph. De Lacy, 3 vols., Berlin, 1978–84, and a number of the smaller works, including the *Institutio Logica*, have appeared in Teubner editions (translation of and commentary on *Institutio Logica* also by J. S. Kieffer, Baltimore, 1964). For the works of Alexander of Aphrodisias, we must still largely rely on the *Commentaria in Aristotelem Graeca* (CAG) edition of the Berlin Academy, but his *De Fato* has received an English edition by R. W. Sharples, London, 1983, and a French (Budé) edition by P. Thillet, Paris, 1984, while translations have now appeared in the new *Ancient Commentators on Aristotle* series (ed. R. Sorabji) of his *Commentary on the Metaphysics*, Book I (W. Dooley), Books II and III (W. Dooley and A. Madigan), *Ethical Problems* (R. W. Sharples); and part of his *Prior Analytics* commentary (J. Barnes et al.); knowledge of what survives of him in Arabic has been greatly increased in recent years, by the work of Richard Walzer, Shlomo Pines, H. Gätje and H.-J. Ruland (see Sharples (1987) bibliography 1226–43).

for some time), but this period, perhaps as a consequence of its high degree of political unrest and upheaval, does seem to have given rise to a series of new developments, both in philosophy proper and in people's attitude to the world in general.

It is dangerous, perhaps, to employ such concepts as 'desire for authority' or 'longing for certainty' as a decisive element in intellectual history – the use of the concept of an 'age of anxiety', after all, to characterize the second and third centuries A.D. has come under fire in recent years. However, it is arguable, I think, that even as a certain weariness with anarchy led ultimately, in the political sphere, to the acceptance of the Principate of Augustus, so on the intellectual level the lack of positive guidance emanating from the sceptical New Academy, and on the other hand the rather tedious quibblings of post-Chrysippan Stoics, led both to a move to return to a more dogmatic interpretation of Platonism and to a lessening of interest in the technicalities of inter-school controversy, which, on the Platonist side, led (via the compromise position on epistemology taken up by Philo of Larisa)¹ to the Stoicizing dogmatism of Antiochus of Ascalon, and, among the Stoics, to the Platonizing 'eclecticism' of Posidonius.

Meanwhile, two further factors of rather contradictory tendency entered the scene. One was the 'rediscovery', in circumstances (if we could only believe them)² rivalling in romance the rediscovery of much of Cicero in the early fifteenth century, of the 'esoteric' works of Aristotle, and their editing by Andronicus of Rhodes. The other was the revival of Pythagoreanism, bringing with it a host of pseudepigrapha, the most significant of which, perhaps, were Ocellus Lucanus, *On the Nature of the Universe*, and Archytas, *On the Categories*.³ Both these developments, however, involve an increased attention to, and reliance on, authority – in the Peripatetic case, issuing in a series of commentaries on Aristotle's works (arranged now for the first time in the order in which we have them, beginning with the logical works, the so-called *Organon*, or 'instrument' of philosophy), which continued to the end of antiquity, but whose finest flowering, perhaps, occurs at the end of our period, in the works of Alexander of Aphrodisias.⁴

All was not dogmatic, however. Presumably as a reaction against the dogmatism of Antiochus, we find arising in the mid-first century B.C. the figure of Aenesidemus, originally an Academic (presumably of the 'Fourth Academy' of Philo of Larisa), who turns his energies to reviving

¹ On this question see the good discussion in Tarrant (1985).

² The best discussion of this fascinating episode is to be found in Moraux (1973) 3–44.

³ There were a great many others, covering most aspects of ethics, politics, physics and metaphysics, and generally designed to upstage Platonists, Peripatetic and even Stoic doctrine by claiming it for Pythagoras. These are collected by Thesleff (1965). ⁴ On Alexander, see now Sharples (1987).

the scepticism of Pyrrho of Elis.⁵ Aenesidemus' chief contribution was actually in the systematizing into a series of ten *tropoi* or 'modes of argument' (mostly adopted from his predecessors among the early Pyrrhonists) all the strategies designed to bring about 'suspension of judgement' (*epokhē*) by casting doubt on our ability to know anything.⁶ He founded a separate school, distinct from Platonism, which appears to have survived to the time of Sextus Empiricus, the learned doctor who is a partisan of the 'empiric' school of medicine, and who celebrates the sceptical tradition in Greek philosophy in an encyclopaedic series of works towards the end of the second century A.D. At some time between Aenesidemus and Sextus, a certain Agrippa reformulated the ten modes as five, but we have no indication as to when or where he operated.⁷

This revived scepticism had a considerable influence on Greek medical theory, but not much on subsequent Platonism. However, such a figure as Plutarch does exhibit at least a sentimental interest in Academic scepticism, employing its arguments and techniques as a weapon to discomfit the Stoics, and he is actually credited with a work (now lost) *On Pyrrho's Ten Modes*, though we do not know what line he took.⁸ The Platonizing sophist Favorinus of Arles also assumed the mantle of Academic scepticism, but he cannot be taken entirely seriously as a philosopher.⁹

II. THE PHILOSOPHICAL SCHOOLS

In general, however, the accent in our period is on authority and tradition. All the four Hellenistic traditions, Platonist, Aristotelian, Stoic and Epicurean, continued vigorous throughout the period – though, interestingly (in the case, at least, of the Platonists and the Aristotelians), without any formal school structure to support them. In the case of the Epicureans, we know from letters in A.D. 121 to Hadrian from Plotina, the widow of Trajan, on behalf of the head of the School, one Popillius Theotimus (and to Theotimus himself), that the School survived intact down to the early second century A.D. at least;¹⁰ and for the Stoics we have on inscriptions the names of persons (otherwise quite unknown) who seem to be scholarchs during the first and second centuries.¹¹ But for the two oldest schools there

⁵ The fact that Aenesidemus is reported (by Phot. *Bibl. cod.* 212, 170a 14) as complaining that the Academy of his day was contaminated by Stoicism seems to place him satisfactorily, as does the fact that he dedicated his work to one L. Tubero, who is probably Cicero's contemporary, L. Aelius Tubero.

⁶ On Aenesidemus and his contribution, see Stough (1969) ch. 4, and the articles by Myles Burnyeat, Gisela Striker and Jonathan Barnes in Schofield *et al.* (1980).

⁷ Sext. Emp. *Pyr.* I 164–78, and Barnes (1990).

⁸ *Cat. Lampr.* no. 178. Straight descriptive titles of this sort, however, are generally not polemical.

⁹ Fragments collected by Barigazzi (1966).

¹⁰ *IG* II² 1099 (also *SG*³ 834); reprinted in Smallwood, *NTH* no. 442.

¹¹ On both Stoics and Epicureans, see Graindor (1934) 203–7, and Lynch (1972) 190.

is no such evidence: indeed, it seems virtually certain that the traditional Academy and Peripatos did not survive the recapture of Athens by Sulla. What succeeded them were small, personal schools, set up by individuals, and continued, perhaps for a generation or two, by their chosen successors, but no central, validating authority which could pronounce on questions of orthodoxy or heresy.¹²

In the Platonist tradition, we find, first of all, after 86 B.C., Antiochus of Ascalon¹³ setting up a school in Athens, not in the Academy, but based in a gymnasium (the Ptolemaion) in the centre of town, consisting, as far as we can see, just of himself and his brother Aristus. This may have continued for a generation (we know of one successor to Aristus), but there is no trace of it after the 40s B.C.

Meanwhile, in Alexandria some tradition of Platonism, in a rather different mode, is attested in the person of Eudorus (fl. c. 25 B.C.) – and by whoever it may have been who taught the Jewish philosopher Philo (c. 20 B.C.–A.D. 50) his Platonism. No clear connection can be established, however, between any such school and Tiberius' court philosopher, Thrasyllus, who produced what was to be the definitive edition of Plato's works, though he too came from Alexandria. The Alexandrian tradition can be characterized, in distinction to the School of Antiochus, by a return to a belief in a transcendental, immaterial reality, and a greater interest in Pythagoreanism, such as was to characterize later Platonism in general.¹⁴

About a century later, in the 60s A.D., we again find a small school of Platonism in Athens, to which Plutarch (c. 45–125) attached himself, presided over by an Egyptian, Ammonius, which continued to Ammonius' death in about A.D. 80, but we do not know whether he left a successor.¹⁵ Plutarch himself, the only Platonist we know of from the end of the first century A.D., chose to establish his school in his native town of Chaeronea. There probably were one or more Platonists teaching in Athens at the time, but it is misleading to suggest that for this reason Plutarch is to be set over against a tradition of 'Schulplatonismus' flourishing in Athens.¹⁶ Any Platonist teaching in Athens would have a certain prestige, but such a person cannot be seen as a generally recognized repository of 'orthodoxy'.

In the generation after Plutarch, in the 140s, we find as the dominant

¹² See on this question, Lynch (1972) 154–62 and Glucker (1978), esp. chs. 3–4. Various aspects of the topic are studied in Dillon and Long (1988).

¹³ On Antiochus, see Dillon (1977) ch. 2, and now Barnes (1989) 51–96.

¹⁴ On Eudorus, see Dillon (1977) ch. 3: 114–35. ¹⁵ On Ammonius, see Jones (1966).

¹⁶ As does Dörrie (1971) 36–56. It is possible, in fact, that one or more of the four Platonic philosophers mentioned in an honorary decree of (Delphi *SEG*³ 11 no. 868), dating from the early second century A.D., was teaching at Athens, but we cannot be certain. The figures of Gaius, teacher of Albinus, and of Nicostratus have to be fitted in somewhere in this period.

Platonist in Athens L. Calvenus Taurus of Beirut,¹⁷ but he is never referred to as 'head of the Academy' or anything such. More or less contemporary with Taurus we find, in Smyrna, a school presided over by Albinus, the pupil of one Gaius (who himself may or may not have taught in Athens). Albinus is the author of one surviving short work, *An Introduction to Plato's Dialogues* (we can no longer confidently identify him with the 'Alcinous' who is the author of the *Didaskalikos*, or 'Handbook of Platonism', as will be explained presently), and he has the distinction of being one of the teachers of Galen.¹⁸

Somewhat later in the century, we find an important Pythagorizing school operating in Apamea in Syria, presided over by Numenius (fl. c. 150), assisted by his companion Cronius.¹⁹ Numenius actually declared himself to be a Pythagorean (though his place is firmly within the Platonist tradition), and he took a considerable interest in oriental religions and philosophies as well, such as Judaism, Zoroastrianism and Brahmanism. He had a considerable influence (whether through direct contact or otherwise) with Plotinus' teacher in Alexandria, Ammonius Saccas, and thus with Plotinus himself.

In the same period, around A.D. 176, the standard-bearer of Platonism in Athens seems to have been Atticus.²⁰ At this point, however, the emperor Marcus Aurelius intervenes significantly, by establishing a series of official posts for representatives of the major philosophical traditions, Platonist, Aristotelian, Stoic and Epicurean,²¹ thus establishing a series of *diadokhai*, or 'successions' of philosophers²² which, in the case of the Platonists, came to be regarded in later centuries as 'the Academy', thus causing confusion in the minds both of later Neoplatonists and modern historians of philosophy. The fate of the other 'successions' is less clear, but the Peripatetic chair began well, being graced before the end of the century by the great commentator Alexander of Aphrodisias, whose inaugural oration to the emperors Severus and Caracalla in A.D. 198 is preserved to us as his treatise *On Fate*.

The history of the Peripatetic tradition in our period is not easy to follow, but seems to have been structurally similar to that of the Platonists. The

¹⁷ The teacher of Aulus Gellius, who records various affectionate anecdotes about him in the *NA*. See Dörrie (1973).

¹⁸ On Albinus, see Dillon (1977) 266–8 (on the problem of 'Alcinous', author of the *Didaskalikos*, see J. Whittaker's intro. to his Budé edn of that work, 1990). Galen tells us that he studied with Albinus in Smyrna (*Libr. Propr.* II, p. 97, 6–10 Müller), at a period which must fall between 144 and 157.

¹⁹ On Numenius, see Dillon (1977) 361–80, and Frede (1987b) 1034–75.

²⁰ We do not actually know where Atticus taught, any more than we can fix the place of his follower Harpocration of Argos. I presume Athens, but Alexandria is a possibility. See Dillon (1977) 247–62.

²¹ Dio LXXII, 31. Cf. Philostr. *VS* 566; Lucian, *Ennuchus*, 3.8.

²² The actual terms *diadokhos* and *diadokhe* go back at least to early Alexandrian times (cf. the work of Sotion of Alexandria, *Diadokhai ton philosophon*), but the title takes on a new significance in this connection.

Peripatos itself probably did not survive as an institution very much longer than the Academy. Andronicus (fl. c. 40 B.C.) certainly gave a considerable impetus to Peripateticism, but we cannot be sure that he was head of the Peripatos in its original form. He does seem to have presided over a school, but his position need not be very different from that of Antiochus *vis-à-vis* the Academy.²³ The Peripatetics of the next generation, such men as Boethus of Sidon (a pupil of Andronicus), Ariston of Alexandria, and Xenarchus of Seleuceia, are a mixed bag. Boethus and Ariston carried forward the tradition begun by Andronicus by writing commentaries on Aristotle's logical writings, and Ariston, at least, made some contribution to Peripatetic logic. Xenarchus, on the other hand, though a Peripatetic, attacked Aristotle's theory of the æther as a fifth element, and is credited with a strongly materialist definition of the soul, both features betokening a sympathy with Stoicism, perhaps of the Posidonian variety.²⁴

Apart from these relatively scholastic figures, we find in the last half of the first century B.C., and the first half of the next century, the more colourful personalities of Arius Didymus, court philosopher of Augustus, and Nicolaus of Damascus, who performed the same role for Herod the Great.²⁵ Arius, who was actually a Stoic by persuasion, composed a comprehensive account of contemporary philosophy, Platonist, Aristotelian and Stoic, of which the Aristotelian section shows no clear influence of Andronicus' revival of the 'esoteric' works, which makes it a valuable record of Hellenistic Peripateticism; while Nicolaus' achievements included a Universal History, in 144 books (lost), a work *On the Philosophy of Aristotle*, of which a fragmentary version survives in Syriac, and a work *On Plants*, based on that of Theophrastus, which also survives, in a Latin version of an Arabic translation.

But all these figures, strictly speaking, predate our period. From the second century A.D. we have a number of names of men who made useful contributions, but we do not know whether they belonged to a single, coherent school (although the fact that two of them come from the same city, Aphrodisias, might indicate a centre of Aristotelianism there). First,

²³ On this see Lynch (1972) chs. 5 and 6, but also Gottschalk, (1987). The claim that Andronicus was head of the Peripatos is based upon Neoplatonic reports that he was 'eleventh in succession from Aristotle' (e.g. Ammonius, *In de Int.* 5.24). However, this may be simply a conclusion arrived at by adding him on after Diodorus of Tyre, the last known scholarch of the Peripatos before 88 B.C. The position is confused, unfortunately, both by the fact that Diodorus' predecessor Critolaus is also described as the eleventh successor by the *Vita Aristotelis Menagiana*, 13, and that Andronicus' follower, Boethus of Sidon is given the same description, again by Ammonius, *In An. Pr.* 31.11. It seems more probable that Andronicus began a school of his own, rather in the manner of Antiochus, and that this was continued by Boethus. Whether he did this in Athens or in Rome is also unclear. On this vexed question see Lynch (1972) 193-4, and *contra*, Moraux (1973) 45-58 and Gottschalk (1987) 1093.

²⁴ On Boethus, see Moraux (1973) 143-79; on Ariston, Moraux (1973) 181-93; on Xenarchus, Moraux (1973) 197-214.

²⁵ On Arius, see Moraux (1973) 259-443; on Nicolaus, Moraux (1973) 445-514.

there is Adrastus of Aphrodisias,²⁶ in the earlier part of the century, who, besides writing on the order of Aristotle's writings, and commenting on the *Nicomachean Ethics*, wrote a commentary on Plato's *Timaus*, of which we find extensive use being made by the Platonist Theon of Smyrna in his *Mathematical Introduction to Plato*, and later by Calcidius in his *Commentary on the Timaeus*. This interest in the *Timaus* (even if only, as seems to be the case, in the 'scientific' aspects of it) is significant in view of the position taken up later by his fellow-citizen, Alexander.

Other than Adrastus, we have a commentary on the *Ethics* from the hand of one Aspasius,²⁷ which in certain significant details concords with contemporary Platonism, and in particular with Plutarch's doctrine in his essay *On Moral Virtue*.²⁸ Then we have Aristocles of Messene, who wrote a *History of Philosophy*, considerable fragments of which are preserved in Eusebius' *Praeparatio Evangelica*, which make it clear that he presented Plato in a most friendly way, but on the other hand reduced him firmly to a mere forerunner of Aristotle. I have suggested elsewhere²⁹ that it was this work, or at least the attitude behind it, which so incensed the Platonist Atticus, provoking him to his polemical tract (also preserved in large fragments by Eusebius) *Against Those who Seek to Interpret Plato through Aristotle*.

In the latter part of the century, we have the figures of Herminius, Sosigenes and Aristoteles of Mytilene, all of whom are credited by our sources with being teachers of Alexander of Aphrodisias,³⁰ and Galen's contemporary Alexander of Damascus, who held the chair of Peripatetic philosophy at Athens, perhaps as its first incumbent. Galen presents him (with approval) as a man of sceptical tendencies, 'well acquainted with Plato, but better with Aristotle' – a remarkable accolade for a professor of Aristotelian philosophy!³¹ Our period ends with the dominant figure of Alexander of Aphrodisias himself, about certain aspects of whose thought we will have more to say below. His essay *On Fate*, being in the nature of an inaugural address, takes on the Stoics with the same asperity as Atticus had earlier taken on the Peripatetics. Alexander is found to continue in many respects his predecessors' hospitality to Platonism, a tendency which made him an acceptable source for Plotinus in the next century.³²

In Stoicism, the most significant figure, at the beginning of our chosen period, is actually something of a maverick, Posidonius of Apamea (135–50 B.C.), who ran a school in Rhodes, and had many pupils, including (in the political arena) Pompey, Cicero and Brutus.³³ Posidonius managed to

²⁶ On Adrastus, see Moraux (1984) 294–332.

²⁷ On Aspasius, see Moraux (1984) 226–293.

²⁸ Notably the Pythagorean-influenced reinforcement of the theory of the mean with the concept of virtue as a musical harmony, and the comparison of reason and the passions to form and matter, cf. Donini (1982) 218. ²⁹ (1977) 249–50.

³⁰ On all these, see Moraux (1984) 335–60 (Sosigenes); 361–98 (Herminius); 399–425 (Aristoteles).

³¹ II 218, 627 Kühn. ³² Cf. P. Merlan (1963) 30–40.

³³ Fragments collected and commented upon by Ian Kidd, in Edelstein and Kidd (1972, 1988).

remain a Stoic while disputing a number of central Stoic doctrines, in particular that of the nature of the soul, displaying in this a distinct tendency towards Platonism, which becomes, though to a lesser degree, a feature of the thought of all the later Stoics we shall be considering. First of all, he accepted the Platonic tripartite soul in preference to the unitary model of orthodox Stoicism, recognizing an irrational part of it which is the natural seat of the passions, which cannot therefore be eradicated, but only moderated (all this we learn from Galen, in the course of his large work *On the Doctrines of Hippocrates and Plato*).³⁴ He also seems to have believed in the survival and independent existence of the soul (Fr. 149 E–K), as, later, both Epictetus and Marcus Aurelius appear to do. Seneca was also influenced by Posidonius, quoting him in various contexts.³⁵ How influential he was for later Platonists is a disputed question, but his influence now tends to be minimized. His doctrine of cosmic *sympatheia* was certainly influential, and comments of his on Plato's *Timaeus* were studied by Plutarch, at least.³⁶ We know of the names of a number of his pupils (Jason, his grandson, who succeeded him, Asclepiodotus, Geminus, Phanius, Diodorus), but his school probably did not long survive his death.

In the following centuries the Stoic School seems to have survived as such, even if dimly, as has been noted. Obscure Stoic *diadokhoi* are mentioned even in the third century by the Middle Platonist Longinus,³⁷ but in general nothing notable was added to Stoic doctrine by school philosophers during our period. The four distinguished figures in Stoicism whom we do have are all to a certain extent peripheral: the Roman statesman and knight, L. Annaeus Seneca (c. 4 B.C.–A.D. 65); the Roman knight from Volsinii, C. Musonius Rufus, part of the 'Stoic opposition' in the time of Nero and the Flavians; his pupil, the Phrygian freed slave Epictetus (c. A.D. 55–135) and the emperor Marcus Aurelius. We must not forget also L. Annaeus Cornutus, a freedman of Seneca, who was the teacher and literary executor of the poet Persius, and author of a book *On the Gods*, which exemplifies Stoic techniques of allegory; and the shadowy figure of Hierocles (early second century A.D.), of whom we have an *Elements of Ethics* partially preserved on papyrus.³⁸

Both Musonius and Epictetus did admittedly run schools (Musonius in Rome, Epictetus first in Rome, then, after being expelled from Rome by

³⁴ It may be significant, in this connection, that Posidonius is one of the few philosophers in the whole period under review whom we know to have been married (140 Edelstein and Kidd), another being that comfortable family man, Plutarch.

³⁵ Sixteen citations from *Ep.* in the index to Edelstein and Kidd.

³⁶ See Edelstein (1936) 286–325. ³⁷ *Ap. Porph., Plot.* ch. 20.

³⁸ On Seneca, see Griffin (1976); on Musonius, Lutz (1947); on Epictetus, Bonhoeffer (1890), (1894); on Hierocles, see now Isnardi Parente (1989). He is earlier than Calvenus Taurus, who liked to quote him against the Epicureans, according to Gell. *NA* ix. 5.8. The papyrus is edited by H. von Arnim (Berliner Klassikertexte 4), Berlin, 1906.

Domitian, at Nicopolis in Epirus), but the Stoicism they purvey is of the popular rather than of the technical variety, and they have no overt ambition to develop or contradict the doctrines of the founders of the movement, Zeno and Chrysippus. This is even more the case with Seneca and Marcus Aurelius. What one does notice in all these writers is a high degree of eclecticism, in the strict sense of that much-abused term – a willingness to borrow thoughts and formulations from Plato and Aristotle (and in Seneca's case, even Epicurus) when they seem conducive to moral uplift.

The survival of a more technical Stoicism might seem indicated by the fact that Plutarch finds it worthwhile to attack it in a number of polemical tracts (e.g. *On Stoic Self-Contradictions*, *Against the Stoics on Common Conceptions*), but it is noteworthy that in these works his main butt is Chrysippus, not any contemporary authority (though he numbered Stoics among his friends and acquaintances).³⁹ If the Stoic school tradition was not quite dead, it seems certainly to have atrophied by this time. Yet the basic tenets of Stoic doctrine continued to be discussed. Apart from the interminable argument as to the relative 'priority', or fundamental nature, of the Aristotelian and Stoic logics,⁴⁰ the main issues were *apatheia*, or 'freedom from passion', as an ideal for the wise man, as opposed to the Aristotelian aim of moderation of the passions (*metriopatheia*), and the question of free will and determinism. Such men as Epictetus and Marcus Aurelius are full of defences of the ideal of the self-sufficiency of virtue for happiness, and of the wise man's freedom from the domination of passion, as well as of the necessity of submission to the course of nature and the decrees of fate,⁴¹ while these positions are correspondingly attacked and ridiculed by Platonists and Aristotelians, such as Plutarch, Taurus or Alexander of Aphrodisias.

As for the Epicureans, we know that their school survived, both from the letters of Plotina mentioned above, and from the testimony of Diogenes Laertius, writing at the end of the second century A.D., who says: 'This school, in contrast to all the others, which have died out, continues for ever, running through a numberless succession of scholarchs.'⁴² However, school Epicureanism leaves no more trace than school Stoicism. Plutarch, for instance, has Epicurean acquaintances, as he has Stoic, but when he attacks the School (as he does in three surviving treatises)⁴³ it is always historical Epicurean figures and positions that he adduces.

³⁹ We do, admittedly, have record of a treatise on fate by one Philopator (in Nemesius, *De Nat. Hom.* 35), and Cornutus is mentioned by Simplicius as joining in the attack on Aristotle's *Categories* (e.g. *In Cat.* 62.27; 129.1–2), but that is not much to show as the product of a couple of hundred years of Stoic speculation after Posidonius.

⁴⁰ A question addressed, for instance, by Galen at the beginning of his *Introduction to Logic* (ed. C. Kalbfleisch, Leipzig: Teubner, 1896). Later Platonist writers, at least, were generally content to use both systems.

⁴¹ See, on all these thinkers, Arnold (1911), Bodson (1967); and on Marcus Aurelius in particular, Brunt (1974) 1–20. ⁴² *Vit. Phil.* x 9. ⁴³ *Non posse*, *Adv. Colotem* and *Lat. Viv.*

Virtually our sole evidence as to the state of Epicurean doctrine in the second century comes from a remote corner of the empire, the city of Oenoanda in Lycia, where, towards the end of the century, a distinguished citizen of the place named Diogenes erected a stoa with a long inscription along the wall, which is a compendium of Epicurean doctrine for the benefit of all passers-by. Rediscovered progressively from 1884 on, and industriously pieced together by a succession of scholars, it is a remarkable and most valuable document, but it testifies, if anything, to the extreme conservatism of the Epicurean tradition.⁴⁴

III. PRINCIPAL DOCTRINES AND TENDENCIES

Apart from the Epicureans, then, there is no clear evidence of a continuous, centralized structure for any of the major schools throughout our period. On the other hand, this lack of a central authority did not prevent the development of a considerable degree of systematization of doctrine. In this the Platonists and the Peripatetics were doubtless influenced by the scholastic tendencies of the Stoic school.⁴⁵ Characteristic activities were the writing of commentaries on source texts, examples being the commentaries on the *Timaens* of Eudorus of Alexandria, Taurus and Atticus (all lost), the anonymous *Theaetetus* commentary (the author of which refers to his own commentaries on the *Phaedo*, *Symposium* and *Timaens*), and the commentaries on Aristotle's works by Peripatetics from Andronicus on down to Alexander;⁴⁶ the composition of introductions (*eisagogai*) to the philosophies of the various schools, exemplified by the *Didaskalikos* of Alcinous⁴⁷ and the *De Platone et eius dogmate* of the Roman rhetorician Apuleius, both being introductions to the philosophy of Plato, or Hierocles' *Elements of Ethics*, an introduction to Stoic ethics, while Diogenes of Oenoanda's inscription constitutes a similar introduction to Epicureanism; or formal treatises on central topics of philosophy, such as the gods (e.g. the Stoic Cornutus' *On the Gods*), fate and free will (e.g. Alexander of Aphrodisias' and Pseudo-Plutarch's treatises *On Fate*), the soul (e.g. Alexander's *On the Soul*, or Plutarch's *On the Creation of the Soul in the Timaens*), the first principle (e.g. Numenius' *On the Good*), or ethical topics, many examples of which survive in the works of Plutarch, such as the essay *On Moral Virtue*, and of Seneca (e.g. *On Anger*, *On Clemency*).

There is evidence for interest in every department of philosophy in this

⁴⁴ Teubner edition (*Diogenes Oenoandensis, Fragmenta*, Leipzig, 1967). Further fragments incorporated, with translation and commentary, in Smith (1993); cf. Smith (1996). There is still more to be discovered.

⁴⁵ A good discussion of this in Donini (1982) ch. 3.

⁴⁶ The later Stoics do not seem to have indulged in this sort of activity, except for Posidonius, at the beginning of our period, and even he wrote comments, not on Zeno or Chrysippus, to whom in any case he was not particularly loyal, but rather on Plato's *Timaens* (Sext. Emp. *Math.* 7. 93).

⁴⁷ Cf. n. 18 above. See now Dillon (1993).

period, but a salient feature uniting all schools is certainly a concern with personal salvation and with man's relation to divinity (whether personal or impersonal). 'Likeness to God' (*homoiosis theoi*), a phrase taken from Plato's *Theaetetus*, 176B, becomes the stated aim of Platonist philosophers in this period (as opposed to the Stoic aim of 'reconciliation to nature' accepted earlier by Antiochus), and surviving Stoic writers in fact subscribe to this ideal, with the proviso that God is to be equated with Nature, while Alexander of Aphrodisias' identification of the Aristotelian Active Intellect of *De Anima* 3.5 with God (as the Unmoved Mover of *Metaphysics* 12) is a significant development in the same direction.

At the beginning of our period, Antiochus of Ascalon⁴⁸ sets the tone by declaring:

The two greatest things in philosophy are the means of judging truth [*kriterion*] and the end of goods [*telos*], and no man can be a sage who is ignorant of the beginning of the process of knowledge or of a final aim of appetition, and who consequently does not know from what point he is starting or at what he ought to arrive.

For Antiochus, as a Stoic fellow-traveller, the end of the journey is assimilation to Nature rather than to a transcendent God, but, if 'God' is read for 'Nature', this is a programme with which any later Platonist would agree. The image of philosophy as a journey through life is notable,⁴⁹ and frequent in later writers of all philosophical persuasions. In Plutarch's essay *On the Obsolescence of Oracles* (410B), at the end of the first century, we find the grammarian Demetrius of Tarsus engaged in literal journeys throughout the known world, 'getting together a history to serve as the basis for a philosophy that had as its aim and end "theology", as he himself named it' – very much like Posidonius in the previous century. The amiable figure of Demetrius may serve as a representative of the philosopher's quest in our period.

Because of this preoccupation, it has been fashionable to speak, rather dismissively, of the philosophy of this period as 'religious philosophy', but this term, thus used, can be just as misleading as the term 'eclecticism' to characterize the period.⁵⁰ Certainly, the nature of the divinity and our relation to it does greatly concern the philosophers of this period, but not much more, I think, than it does Plato, Aristotle or the founders of Stoicism. It does not connote the subordination of philosophy to some religious purpose, which is what such a term would normally imply, nor does it betoken a lessening of interest in other philosophical issues, as I hope to show.

⁴⁸ As reported by Cicero, *Acad. Pr.* 29.

⁴⁹ Taking its inspiration, at least in part, from the famous question of Socrates that begins Plato's *Phaedrus*, 'Whither and whence, dear Phaedrus?'; but also, no doubt, from allegorical exegesis of the *Odyssey*. ⁵⁰ On this latter term, see Dillon and Long (1988), esp. Donini, (1988) 17–33.

In the Platonist tradition, we find, first, a reassertion of the transcendence and immateriality of God, after the rather ambiguous, but Stoicizing, position taken up by Antiochus, and then, in consequence, the progressive working-out of God's relationship with the world, chiefly by the postulation of intermediate entities. First, Eudorus of Alexandria propounds, as a first principle, a One above a pair of opposites, another One and an Indefinite Dyad – a scheme which he fathers on the Pythagoreans.⁵¹ We know all too little about the rest of his metaphysics, but some idea of the possible ways in which this tendency to transcendence could develop may be gleaned from a study of the thought of the Jewish philosopher Philo of Alexandria, most of whose voluminous works have come down to us.

Philo is not, strictly speaking, a Platonic philosopher (he would regard himself, rather, as a *Mosaic* philosopher, claiming as he does that all Greek philosophy derives ultimately from the teachings of Moses),⁵² but he constitutes good evidence for trends in contemporary Greek philosophy, and particularly Middle Platonism. He describes God as 'one' (though never 'the One' in the neuter) and 'monad', and adopts as God's instrument of contact with the world the Stoic *logos*. Philo is also our earliest clear witness to the concept of the forms as thoughts of God, forming, indeed, a whole 'intelligible world' (*kosmos noetos*),⁵³ which serves as a paradigm for the physical world. In a way, this intelligible world *is* the *logos*, but the *logos* may also be seen as presiding over it (it is described as the 'place' of the forms at *De Opificio Mundi* 20).⁵⁴ At any rate, the *logos*, in its various aspects, is Philo's answer to the problem of how a totally transcendent God relates to the world. We do not know what was the scheme favoured by Eudorus.

Philo's solution was not adopted, so far as we can see, by any subsequent Platonist before Plotinus.⁵⁵ The intermediaries adopted are rather the *demiourgos* or 'creator-god', and/or the World Soul of the *Timaean*, or simply the forms (often, significantly, in the singular – *idea* – not the plural). This latter term is found in the basic doxographic formulations of Platonic doctrine in this period as the middle one of a triad of principles God–Form–Matter,⁵⁶ and, especially when referred to in the singular, seems to fulfil at least one aspect of the role of the *logos*, as being the paradigmatic cause of the physical world, and the contents of the mind of God. This basic triad,

⁵¹ *ap. Simpl. In Phys.* 181 Diels. Whatever his justification for attributing this doctrine to 'the Pythagoreans', it seems to me clear that Eudorus is adopting it himself.

⁵² See Dillon (1977) 139–44.

⁵³ *De opif.* 16; cf. *Quod det.* 75–6. On the possible origins of the concept, see Rich (1954) 123–33.

⁵⁴ A formulation borrowed, no doubt, from Aristotle's report of Platonist terminology at *De An.* III.4, 429a27, though there the reference is to the soul.

⁵⁵ Though Plutarch certainly makes use of the concept of *logos* in his *De Is. et Os.*, cf. Dillon (1977) 200–1, and below, p. 935.

⁵⁶ Aetius, *Plac.* 287. 17 ff. Diels; Plut. *Quaest. conv.* 8.2, 720b; Alcinous, *Did.* ch. 9; Apul. *De dog. Plat.* 1.5. Alcinous and Apuleius are careful to refer to 'the forms' in the plural; the first two sources simply speak of 'Form'.

however, proved unsatisfactory to many thinkers, as it failed to provide for Plato's 'Craftsman' (*demiourgos*) and World Soul.

To a large extent, the activity of later Platonists can be seen as an unending effort to tie up apparent loose ends in Plato's philosophy, including the role of the Craftsman in the universe, and the relationship with his intelligible model (*paradeigma*) on the one hand and the World Soul on the other. This is not solely a matter of the exegesis of the *Timaeus*; the myth of the *Statesman* must be considered as well, and the soul or souls discussed in Book x of the *Laws* – and then the relation of all these entities to the Good of *Republic* VI. What we find is a variety of accommodations. Once it is decided that the Craftsman of the *Timaeus* is not a supreme deity, but is subordinate to the Good (and also, in later Platonism, to the One of the *Parmenides*), then, whether or not one takes the *Timaeus* scenario literally, he must be seen as a mediating, creative entity, as opposed to the supreme God, who transcends all action or direct relationship with what is below him.⁵⁷ The forms, or the Model, are then to be taken as the contents of the mind of this secondary god, who thus becomes an active, creative *intellect*. However, this intellect now seems to encroach on the proper activity of the World Soul as depicted in the *Timaeus*, so that the World Soul tends to be deprived of its rational, ordering aspect, and becomes a rather passive, essentially irrational entity, requiring the bestowal of order and reasoning upon it from the Creator God, like the Soul of the *Statesman* myth.

However, these developments, which were to be so important for Neoplatonism, take on this clear form only in the system of Numenius. Elsewhere the situation is more fluid. In Alcinous' *Didaskalikos*, for instance, we have, in chapter 10, a system which seems to involve two levels of divinity, a supreme deity, exhibiting features of both the Good of Plato's *Republic* VI and the Unmoved Mover of Aristotle's *Metaphysics* XII, and a secondary god, the 'Intellect of the World Soul', who can be seen as a demythologized version of the Craftsman of the *Timaeus*, and then a World Soul, but the precise nature of the system described is disputable.⁵⁸

Alcinous, however, like Numenius, contrives to accommodate the various Platonic entities in a reasonably coherent structure, with, in his case, a little help from Aristotle. In the next generation, a complementary rapprochement takes place on the Aristotelian side, in the thinking of Alexander of Aphrodisias.⁵⁹ In his treatise *On the Soul*, which is of course firmly based on that of Aristotle, but contains original developments, he tackles the problem of the identity of the Active Intellect of Aristotle's *De Anima* III.5, by identifying it not only with the Unmoved Mover, but also, implicitly, with the Good of the *Republic*, and thus with the supreme

⁵⁷ This is Numenius' formulation, Fr. 12 des Places.

⁵⁸ Cf. Loenen (1956) 296–319, and (1957) 35–56; and *contra* Mansfeld (1972) 61–80.

⁵⁹ See the useful article of Sharples (1987).

God.⁶⁰ This entity he presents, as does Alcinoüs, as an intellect 'in activity' (*kat' energeian*), whose contents are forms (*eide*), though not necessarily forms in the Platonic sense. Indeed, Alexander is able to stay within the legitimate terminology of Aristotelianism (even his use of the Sun Simile is warranted by Aristotle's use of sunlight imagery in *De Anima* III 5 – where Aristotle himself may well have had *Republic* VI in mind), while in fact taking an important step in the direction of Platonism.⁶¹

A problem that arises in connection with the nature of deity is that of dualism. Platonism is not in its origins dualist (in the sense of postulating two opposing principles in the universe),⁶² despite the ambiguities of *Laws* x; nor, *a fortiori*, is Aristotelianism. But we do find in this period, both in the Neopythagorean school of Numenius and in a (relatively) mainline thinker like Plutarch, a dualistic tendency which, in some of Plutarch's utterances, at least, comes close to Gnosticism. Plutarch believes in a Platonist supreme principle, of course, which he terms 'real being', 'One' and 'the Good',⁶³ but he also postulates an archetypal opposing principle, presented as the Pythagorean 'Indefinite Dyad' (*Def. Or.* 428F). Of course, the adoption of such an entity is justified by its reported acceptance by Plato in his 'unwritten teachings', but Plutarch lends it a positive force for evil that is not attested for Plato. In his essay *On Isis and Osiris* (especially 373AB), he presents a complex system of entities, comprising, first, God himself (the Good, or the One), with Osiris as his *logos* in its transcendent aspect (i.e. as the contents of the divine mind), then 'the body of Osiris' as the immanent aspect of *logos*, or form in matter, which is constantly attacked and rent asunder by the indefinite Dyad, represented by Typhon, and continually gathered up and reassembled by the World Soul, represented by Isis. As a conspectus of Plutarch's system, the exegesis of the Isis–Osiris myth presented here serves very well. Plutarch, unlike most other Middle Platonists of whom we have any information, opts for a demiurgic Logos-figure, and an irrational (but positively inclined) World Soul, ready and willing to receive ordering from above.

Plutarch also chooses to take the creation-myth of the *Timaeus* literally, which leaves him with a period when the natural disorder of the World Soul prevails, before it is brought to order by the demiurgic Intellect. He expounds his views on this in his essay *On the Creation of the Soul in the Timaeus*, where he shows a defiant consciousness of being out of line with the mainstream of later Platonist opinion.

A further topic which must also be touched on in this connection is the doctrine of daemons as intermediate beings between god and man, a

⁶⁰ *De Anima* 88.23–91.4 (Bruns); cf. Sharples (1987) 1204–14.

⁶¹ If it is indeed his step. He may have inherited it from his predecessors. Cf. Sharples (1990) 85–95.

⁶² In the other sense of the term, 'postulating two levels of reality', it of course is.

⁶³ E.g. *De E*, 392–3; *Def. Or.* 423D.

subject discussed in such works as Plutarch's dialogue *On the Daemon of Socrates*, and Apuleius' essay on the same subject. Plutarch's doctrine especially is rich in complexity and contradictions, which cannot be gone into in the present context.⁶⁴ In the Stoic camp Posidonius had already, back in the first century B.C., written a work in more than one book *On Heroes and Daemons* (Fr. 24 E-K), about the contents of which we know very little, or of how nearly it conformed to Stoic orthodoxy. He held, at any rate, that they were composed of aetherial fire, and had knowledge of the future (cf. also Fr. 108 E-K).

Despite the claim at the outset of this section that theology was not the overwhelming preoccupation of philosophers in this period, I have dwelt at some length on Platonist and Aristotelian conceptions of the deity, since that is the area in which the most interesting developments can be documented.⁶⁵ However, it must be emphasized that we have evidence of continued interest and development in all branches of philosophy, logic, ethics and physics, characteristically with a degree of cross-fertilization between the schools.

In the area of logic, the argument as to the relative validity of the Peripatetic and Stoic systems continued, with the Platonists, at least, feeling free to use either, though preferring the Peripatetic, and indeed discerning examples of all the figures in Plato's work, as we can see Alcinous, for instance, doing in *Didaskalikos* chapter 6. Galen takes an interesting line in his *Introduction to Logic*,⁶⁶ accepting Stoic hypothetical syllogisms as a development of Theophrastean hypotheticals, and dismissing as unimportant the question of the relative priority of the two systems. No ancient authority seems fully conscious of the contrast between a logic of propositions and logic of terms. By the beginning of our period, in fact, Aristotle's system had already undergone certain subtle changes which transpose it into the 'classical' form in which it became known, through Boethius, to the mediaeval world,⁶⁷ and the rather superfluous Fourth Figure had been added, for 'completeness', to the syllogistic system. We know from Alexander's commentary on the *Prior Analytics* that his own teacher Herminus still found innovations to propose in the system, of some of which he himself disapproved.⁶⁸ Of developments in Stoic logic in our

⁶⁴ See on this Dillon (1977) 216–24 and Brenk (1986).

⁶⁵ Even this survey is only partial. Other developments deserving of note are the interesting use being made by the Neopythagorean Moderatus of Gades (end of first cent. A.D.) of both the latter part of Plato's *Parmenides* and the Second Platonic Letter (312E) to construct an apparent system of three hypostases (cf. Dodds (1928) 129–42); and the very Platonist theologizing of the pseudo-Aristotelian *De Mundo* (possibly emanating from first cent. B.C. Alexandria).

⁶⁶ Useful translation and commentary by Kieffer (1964).

⁶⁷ A process well described in ch. 1 of Patzig (1968).

⁶⁸ E.g. *In An. Pr.* 72.26 ff., Herminus' attempt to find a 'natural' major term for the Second Figure. Cf. Moraux (1984) 385–6.

period we know nothing, though Cicero's *De Fato*, if we can trust it, gives evidence of scholastic developments at an earlier period.

In epistemology, chapter 4 of Alcinous' *Didaskalikos* gives evidence of continuing refinements in Platonist doctrine as to the relationship between sense-perception and knowledge, with a higher value being placed on sense-perception than would be strictly Platonic, probably under the influence of Stoicism, mediated by Antiochus of Ascalon,⁶⁹ but possibly going back even to Speusippus (cf. Fr. 75 Tarán). Of contemporary Peripatetic epistemology we find a good account in Alexander, *De Anima* 83.2–87.23 Bruns. He begins with the rise of the soul from corporeal mixture (his doctrine here has been seen as rather more materialistic than Aristotle's own, owing something, perhaps, to the views of Strato of Lampsacus). He then describes the various types of soul that proceed from increasingly complex combinations of elements, until this process reaches the intellective soul in man. Man shares in common with animals a progression from sensation to imagination to memory. His specific difference is that he may proceed further to the abstraction, conservation and knowledge of enmattered form. Alexander then presents the development of intellection in three phases: the potential or material intellect; intellect in the state of possession; and the intellect in actuality, demonstrating the reason for each evolutionary advance. The whole passage is a most important statement of later Peripatetic psychology and epistemology.⁷⁰

In ethics, Platonism continues to oscillate between the poles of Aristotelian 'moderation of the passions' (*metriopatheia*) and the importance of the three grades of good, spiritual, corporeal and external, for the attainment of happiness, on the one hand, and the Stoic ideal of 'extirpation of the passions' (*apatheia*), and the sufficiency of virtue alone for happiness, on the other. Alcinous, Apuleius and Plutarch take the Aristotelian line, Atticus and (probably) Numenius the Stoic line. Among the Stoics themselves not much development of a technical nature is observable, though Hierocles' statement of the basic principles of Stoic ethical theory (*oikeiosis*) is a technical exposition unequalled in our other sources,⁷¹ but Epictetus developed, or at least exhibits, a distinctive use of the term *prohairesis*, which in Aristotle means simply 'choice', to denote something far wider, 'moral character' or 'personality', and as such it becomes a concept of considerable importance to him.⁷² What is interesting about this is that it may be as near as the Greeks got to the concept of the will as a distinct element in the make-up of the personality, especially if Epictetus is being influenced here, as seems probable, by Seneca's concept of *voluntas*.⁷³ For Epictetus,

⁶⁹ Cf. Cicero's account of Antiochian doctrine in *Acad. Pr.* 19–21 and 30.

⁷⁰ I am indebted for this summary of Alexander's doctrine to Schroeder and Todd (1990) 13 ff. See also discussion of Galen's epistemology in Frede (1981) 279–98. ⁷¹ See now Isnardi Parente (1989).

⁷² On this see Rist (1969) 228–31. ⁷³ Cf. Kahn, (1988) 251–5.

prohairesis largely supersedes the traditional, 'intellectualist' Stoic term *hegemonikon*, or 'ruling element' of the soul.

Marcus Aurelius is distinctive in his strong separation of mind from soul as well as soul from body.⁷⁴ This clear distinction of *nous* from *psyche* may be ultimately derivable from an interpretation of Aristotle (particularly *De An.* III.5), but it finds a more immediate parallel in Plutarch's equally remarkable tripartition of the individual, particularly clearly exemplified in his essays *On the Face in the Moon* (943A ff.) and *On the Daemon of Socrates* (591D ff.), but also observable in his essay *On Moral Virtue* (441D ff.). Where this doctrine comes from is not clear, but it is certainly not Old Stoic (though it may go back to Posidonius), and this, together with talk of God's providence, and even of the separation of the soul from the toils of bodily existence,⁷⁵ are instances of significant cross-fertilization in the thought of these later Stoics. All the 'Roman' Stoics, Seneca (e.g. *Letters* 41.3), Epictetus (e.g. *Disc.* II 8.11–14), and Marcus (e.g. *Medit.* II.17) are remarkable in treating the *nous* within us as a *daemon*, or even as a manifestation of God, whom we must obey. This, too can be seen as a Platonic influence, and can be paralleled in Plutarch (*De Gen. Socr.* 591D–592E).

In an area which straddles the boundary between ethics and physics, that of fate and free will and God's providence, much work was done on the Platonist and Peripatetic side to try to counter the challenge of Stoic determinism, and to vindicate the autonomy of the human soul. A curious monument to this concern is the essay *On Fate* falsely attributed to Plutarch, but certainly the work of a first- or second-century Platonist.⁷⁶ A distinctive feature of this work (which is picked up in two later authors, Calcidius and Nemesius of Emesa, who seem to be dependent on the same source as is our author) is a triadic division of levels of providence, undertaken in an attempt to subsume both fate and free will under it. It cannot be said to be successful in its object, but it is an interesting record of philosophical activity in this area.⁷⁷ Alexander's treatise *On Fate* (and a treatise *On Providence* preserved only in Arabic) is evidence of a similar concern to deal with Stoic determinism on the part of the Peripatetics, who had, in addition, to counter the accusation levelled at them by certain Platonists that they denied providence in the sublunary sphere. Alexander asserts that providence is to be found in the effect of the regular heavenly motions on the sublunary world, in preserving the continuity of species; it does not, however, extend to the level of the fortunes of individuals.⁷⁸ The problem of fate and free will continued, to be tackled by Plotinus in an important

⁷⁴ E.g. *Medit.* III.16; XII.3.

⁷⁵ E.g. Epictetus, *Disc.* 1.9, 10 ff.; Marcus Aurelius, *Medit.* x.1.

⁷⁶ Edition by E. Valgiglio, *Pseudo-Plutarch, De Fato*, Rome, 1964. Also to be found in vol. VII of the Loeb Plutarch *Moralia*, ed. De Lacy and Einarson.

⁷⁷ See Dillon (1977) 320–6 for a more detailed discussion.

and penetrating treatise (which does not, however, solve the problem), *Ennead* III.2–3.

The Epicureans have not yet figured in our survey, for the sufficient reason that they have left no record of original engagement with any of the main problems of philosophy in this period. However, Diogenes of Oenoanda does give evidence of scholastic activity (flourishing schools in Athens and Rhodes, at least), and he exhibits a few features not attested previously (though not necessarily therefore innovations of our period),⁷⁹ as well as indulging in vigorous polemic against all the other schools. It is to be hoped that more of his great inscription may yet be recovered.

An interesting feature of our period is the interaction of philosophy, chiefly Platonism, with the steadily spreading movements of both 'main-line' Christianity and the various Gnostic sects. Philosophical influence is already discernible in the prologue of John's Gospel, and at various points in the Pauline Epistles, but it is not really until the second century that one finds attempts, by such figures as Justin Martyr (c. 100–165) and Clement of Alexandria (c. 150–215), to give Christianity a comprehensive philosophical underpinning. Both Justin and Clement fell foul of later orthodoxy, mainly because of their (quite understandable) tendency to see Christ as the Platonist secondary god, Demiurge or Logos, but they both performed considerable services for Christianity as an intellectual movement.⁸⁰

Less orthodox, and much wilder in their speculations, are the great Gnostic teachers of the second century, such as Valentinus and Basilides (both fl. c. 150, in Rome and Alexandria respectively, although Valentinus was educated in Alexandria). Basilides' conception of a supreme, ineffable God, who is 'nonexistent', as being superior to existence, seems to anticipate Neoplatonism, but may derive from Neopythagorean speculations based on a metaphysical interpretation of the second part of Plato's *Parmenides*; while the Demiurge of Valentinian and other Gnostic systems plainly owes something to an ingenious perversion of the Demiurge of the *Timaeus*. Other areas of the intellectual 'underworld' of the second century too, such as the Hermetic writings and the Chaldaean Oracles, owe a good deal to contemporary Platonism and Stoicism, while – paradoxically, perhaps – Christian polemic against traditional Hellenic mythology and religion owes much to Epicurean and Sceptic arguments against the existence of the traditional gods.⁸¹

⁷⁸ See on this the discussion of Sharples (1987) 1216–20.

⁷⁹ A distinction of three types of cause, Fr. 27 Chilton, and an interesting theory about influences from the gods through their statues, New Fr. 115 Smith. On this latter question, cf. Frischer (1982) on the importance of images of Epicurus himself (esp. 118–20).

⁸⁰ On Justin, see Andresen (1955); on Clement, Lilla (1971).

⁸¹ On Gnosticism, see Rudolph (1983).

IV. THE PHILOSOPHER IN SOCIETY

It seems suitable, in a contribution to a general history, to close with some remarks as to the role or roles assumed by philosophers in society, as these were varied and important. We may distinguish the philosopher as teacher from the philosopher as statesman, or at least public figure.⁸²

As teachers, the philosophers of our period were available to instruct, not only those who had a 'professional' interest in philosophy, but also young men of good family who wished to complete their education, but whose primary interest might be law or the public service. Cicero furnishes a good example at the beginning of our period, in attaching himself first at Rome to Philo of Larissa, and then going on to Athens to study with Antiochus of Ascalon, and to Rhodes, to sit at the feet of Posidonius. Later, he sent his son Marcus to Athens to study with the Peripatetic Cratippus.

A century later, Plutarch's teacher Ammonius, a Greek from Egypt, is found occupying an important position in Athenian public life, being at least three times elected *strategos*, and being entrusted with the yearly examination of the epehebes.⁸³ He plainly had in his school many who were not serious philosophers. Such is also the case with Taurus in the middle of the second century, as we can see from the pages of the *Attic Nights* of Aulus Gellius, one of his appreciative non-philosophical pupils (Gellius became a lawyer). Apuleius went to Athens at about this time also to complete his education, though we do not know who his teachers were. In the same period also, Galen, whose interests were primarily medical, studied with, among others, the Platonist Albinus at Smyrna.⁸⁴ Peripatetic and Stoic philosophers no doubt performed the same role, though documentation is lacking, with the notable exception of the relationship between Epictetus and Arrian (and to some extent the various figures in the 'Stoic opposition' under Nero).

Besides running a school to which all might come (and here we may note that we know remarkably little about how one enrolled, or what the financial or administrative arrangements were in the philosophical schools),⁸⁵ a philosopher might also, as in later ages, attach himself to a monarch or other noble patron, and become a court or house philosopher. Conspicuous examples are Arius Didymus at the court of Augustus, Philodemus the Epicurean at the house of L. Calpurnius Piso, Nicolaus of Damascus with Herod the Great, the Pythagoreanizing Platonist Thrasyllus with Tiberius, and Seneca (rather unhappily) with Nero. Marcus

⁸² The philosopher is not yet a 'holy man', as he becomes in the Neoplatonic period, perhaps in reaction to the growth of the Christian and Manichean cult of saints. In our period only a few fringe figures, such as Apollonius of Tyana, Alexander of Abonuteichus, or Julian the Theurgist fill that role.

⁸³ See Jones (1966) 205-13.

⁸⁴ Cf. n. 18 above.

⁸⁵ See Dillon (1979) 63-77.

Aurelius himself recalls his teachers at the beginning of his *Meditations*, and they include both Stoics and Platonists, the former including Plutarch's nephew Sextus!

Marcus' great contribution to philosophical education at Athens in A.D. 176 has already been mentioned. He entrusted Herodes Atticus, himself a great patron of philosophers (notably of Taurus) with selecting the first incumbents of the various chairs, whose successors were thereafter to be selected by the Areopagus.⁸⁶ How far schools of philosophy elsewhere were endowed by the central government is not clear, but Hadrian seems to have done a certain amount in this regard, and many were certainly endowed by municipal authorities.⁸⁷

As public figures, philosophers were in demand as ambassadors (though not to the same extent as were the great sophists of the time), and from time to time even as administrators. Notable examples of the former activity are Philo, leading a delegation of the Jews of Alexandria to Caligula – though he was there primarily as a member of the most prominent family of Jewish Alexandria – and Plutarch going to Rome on some unspecified public business at least twice in the period A.D. 75–95. Examples of administrators are furnished by Plutarch's teacher Ammonius, as mentioned above, and by Plutarch himself, if Eusebius' report is correct that he was in his old age appointed by Hadrian Procurator of Achaëa.⁸⁸ Again, the unnamed Platonist who was Galen's teacher at Pergamum was so much in demand in public affairs that Galen complains that he saw very little of him (*De an. morb.* 8).

That philosophers were prominent citizens, however, is plain enough. Taurus, as we learn from an anecdote of Aulus Gellius' (*NA* x. 2), was on good terms with the governor of Crete, who called on him when he was in Athens (he had probably been a pupil). Taurus was also, like the four philosophers mentioned earlier, honoured by the Delphians,⁸⁹ with the ancient equivalent of an honorary degree. An entertaining portrait of a (presumably real) philosopher of the mid-second century is furnished by Lucian's account of Demonax, who was, if Lucian is to be believed, a true eclectic, of Cynic tendency, but a widely respected public figure.

Philosophy, particularly in the forms of a generalized Platonism or simplified Stoicism, pervaded the culture of the later Roman empire. For statesmen, sophists, doctors or lawyers, to have taken courses in philosophy from one or more of the philosophical traditions constituted the sort of necessary background that exposure to Classics used to provide in

⁸⁶ For an amusingly satirical account of this process in respect of the chair of Peripatetic philosophy, see Lucian's *Eunuchus* (where the bothersome phrase *ton Peripatitikon ton heteron* can, I think, be taken to mean 'the second of the Peripatetics').

⁸⁷ Antoninus Pius had established municipal chairs in cities besides Athens, *H.A.M. Ant.* II. 3.

⁸⁸ *Euseb. Chron.* A.D. 119. ⁸⁹ Cf. above, n. 16.

modern society up to a generation ago. In the absence of an agreed religious orthodoxy, a general knowledge of the main issues of philosophy and of some of the generally favoured solutions to them was part of the intellectual baggage of every educated man.

CHRONOLOGICAL TABLE

A.D.	Rome and Italy	Foreign Affairs	Literature, Philosophy and Art
	69 Accession of Vespasian (acclamation <i>July</i> 1, <i>lex de imperio</i> late <i>Dec.</i>)		
70	70 Vespasian at Alexandria; reaches Rome (<i>Sept.—Oct.</i>)	70 Titus captures Jerusalem (<i>Sept.</i> 8); defeat of the Batavian revolt	70 Laying of foundation stone of the Capitoline Temple (<i>June</i> 21)
	71 Titus returns from the East (<i>Spring</i>), receives proconsular imperium and shares tribunician power with Vespasian. Jewish Triumph (<i>June</i>)		
	71–5 Banishment from Rome of <i>astrologi</i> and <i>philosophi</i>		
		72/3 Annexation of Commagene. Armenia Minor added to Cappadocia	
		c. 72–7 Annexation of Emesa	
	73–4 Censorship of Vespasian and Titus; adlections to the Senate	73 or 74 Fall of Masada (<i>May</i>)	
	75 Visit of M. Julius Agrippa II and Berenice to Rome; banishment of Helvidius Priscus	74 Grant of Latin right to Spain	
		c. 77–84 Agricola governor of Britain	c. 75–79 Josephus, <i>Bell. Jud.</i> , Pliny. <i>Nat. Hist.</i>
	78 or 79 Conspiracy of A. Caecina Alienus and Epruius Marcellus		
	79 Death of Vespasian (<i>June</i> 24). Accession of Titus. Eruption of Vesuvius (<i>Aug.</i> 24). Fire at Rome		

A.D.	Rome and Italy	Foreign Affairs	Literature, Philosophy and Art
80			80 Dedication of Colosseum; destruction of Capitoline Temple by fire 80 Dedication of arch of Titus
	81 Death of Titus (<i>Sept.</i> 13). Accession of Domitian		82 Dedication of restored Capitoline Temple (<i>Dec.</i> 7)
	83 Domitian's triumph over the Chatti		
83/4	Increase of legionary pay		
85	85 Domitian <i>censor perpetuus</i>	85 or 86 Revolt of Nasamones in Africa 85–88 Dacian war	
	86 Inauguration of the Capitoline Games		
	88 Ludi Saeculares held		
	89 Edict against <i>astrologi</i> and <i>philosophi</i>	89 Rebellion of L. Antonius Saturninus	
90		91 <i>Lex Imitana</i>	90s Quintilian, <i>Institutio Oratoria</i>
	93 Pliny praetor. Trials of Baebius Massa, Herennius Senecio, Helvidius Priscus, Arulenus Rusticus	c. 93–120 Vindolanda tablets written	92 Palaces on the Palatine completed c. 93–4 Josephus, <i>Ant. Jud.</i>
95	95 Philosophers expelled from Italy. Flavius Clemens and Acilius Glabrio put to death		
	96 Assassination of Domitian (<i>Sept.</i> 18). Accession of Nerva; adoption of Trajan		96 Dedication of Forum Nervae
	98 Death of Nerva (<i>Jan.</i> 27). Accession of Trajan		98 Tacitus, <i>Agricola</i> and <i>Germania</i>
	99 Trajan enters Rome (<i>autumn</i>)		
100	100 <i>Alimenta</i> schemes instituted	100 Foundation of Thamugadi 101–2 First Dacian War	100 Pliny the Younger, <i>Panegyricus</i>
		c. 104 Withdrawal from Scotland	103 Reconstruction of Circus Maximus
105		105–6 Second Dacian War, creation of province of Dacia	

	106–11	Creation of province of Arabia		107/8	Dedication to Mars Ultor of monument at Adamklissi	
110	c. 109–12	Pliny the Younger governor of Bithynia-Pontus		c. 108	Tacitus, <i>Historiae</i>	
	113	Trajan leaves Rome for war against Parthia (<i>Oct.</i> 27)		112	Dedication of the Forum Traiani (<i>Jan.</i>)	
	114	Annexation of Armenia, Mesopotamia and Assyria		113	Trajan's column	
115	115	Capture of Ctesiphon		c. 113	New harbour at Ostia completed	
	115–17	Jewish diaspora revolt				
	116	Revolt against Rome in the East				
	117	Death of Trajan (by <i>Aug.</i> 9); accession of Hadrian (<i>Aug.</i> 11)				
	118	Execution of four consulars. Hadrian reaches Rome (<i>July</i> 9)	118	Abandonment of Trajan's eastern conquests except Armenia	c. 118–128	Reconstruction of Pantheon
120		Antoninus consul		c. 120	Tacitus, <i>Annales</i>	
	121–5	Hadrian's first provincial tour				
	122	Hadrian visits Britain, construction of wall began. Second Moorish revolt				
	124	Hadrian's first visit to Athens and Eleusis		c. 126	Death of Plutarch	
125	c. 127	Appointment of four consular legates for Italy				
	128–32	Hadrian's second provincial tour		129	Birth of Galen	
130	130	Aelia Capitolina founded on site of Jerusalem. Antinoupolis founded by Hadrian (<i>Oct.</i> 30)		131/2	Completion of temple of Olympian Zeus at Athens	
135	131/2	Inauguration of the Panhellenion				
	131–5	Bar Kochba revolt				

A.D.	Rome and Italy	Foreign Affairs	Literature, Philosophy and Art
		131–7 Arrian governor of Cappadocia	135 Temple of Venus and Rome dedicated
	136 Adoption of L. Commodus; execution of Julius Servianus		
	138 Antoninus adopted As co-regent (<i>Feb.</i> 25). Death of Hadrian (<i>July</i> 10)		
140	140 First consulship of Marcus Aurelius	139–142 Construction of Antonine wall in Britain	139 Dedication of Mausoleum of Hadrian
			143 Herodes Atticus and Fronto consuls
145			<i>c.</i> 143–4 Aelius Aristides, <i>Eis Rhomen</i>
150		152 Peace re-established in Mauretania Caesariensis and Tingitana	145 Temple dedicated to Divus Hadrianus
		157–8 Operations against Dacian tribes	
155		159 Dacia divided into three parts	
160	160 Marcus Aurelius and L. Verus appointed consuls designate	160 Risings in Africa suppressed	
	161 Death of Antoninus Pius (<i>March</i> 7). Accession of Marcus Aurelius; L. Verus given the title Augustus		
165		162–166 Parthian war of L. Verus	<i>c.</i> 162–200 Galen at Rome
	<i>c.</i> 166 Appointment of senatorial <i>iuridici</i> for Italy	166–170s Plague spreads from Seleucia to Asia Minor, Egypt, Italy and the Rhine	
		166 Marcus Aurelius and L. Verus celebrate a joint triumph (<i>Oct.</i> 12)	
		167–175 Marcommanic wars	
	169 Death of L. Verus (<i>Jan.</i>)		
170		172 Revolt of Boukoloi in Egypt	
		175 Revolt of Avidius Cassius, governor of Syria (<i>April</i>). Cassius killed (<i>July</i>)	174 Marcus Aurelius begins his <i>Meditations</i> ; trial of Herodes Atticus
175			176 Arches of Marcus Aurelius
			176 (<i>after</i>) Column of Marcus Aurelius

	177	Consulship of Commodus, who is named Augustus	177	<i>Tabula Banasitana</i> . Martyrdoms at Lyons
180	180	Accession of Commodus	178–180	Germanic wars on Danube
	182	Conspiracy of Lucilla	180	Death of Marcus Aurelius (<i>Mar.</i> 17)
185	185	Fall of Perennis		
			186	Pertinax suppresses mutiny of the armies in Britain
			188	Roman victory against revolt in Germany
190	190	Fall of Cleander	190	Pertinax crushes disorder in Africa
	192	Murder of Commodus (<i>Dec.</i> 31)		

BIBLIOGRAPHY

ABBREVIATIONS

This list does not include the standard abbreviations used for literary works, legal sources, inscriptions, papyri etc.

<i>AAAS</i>	<i>Annales archéologiques arabes syriennes</i>
<i>AAntHung</i>	<i>Acta Antiqua Academiae Scientiarum Hungaricae</i>
<i>AArchHung</i>	<i>Acta Archaeologica Academiae Scientiarum Hungaricae</i>
<i>AC</i>	<i>L'Antiquité classique</i>
<i>AClass</i>	<i>Acta Classica. Proceedings of the Classical Association of South Africa</i>
<i>Acta RCRF</i>	<i>Acta Rei Cretariae Romanae Fautorum</i>
<i>ADAJ</i>	<i>Annual of the Department of Antiquities of Jordan</i>
<i>AE</i>	<i>L'année épigraphique</i>
<i>AEA</i>	<i>Archivo Español de Arqueología</i>
<i>AHR</i>	<i>American Historical Review</i>
<i>AIIN</i>	<i>Annali dell'Istituto Italiano di Numismatica</i>
<i>AION</i>	<i>Annali dell'Istituto Universitario Orientale di Napoli: Archaeologia e Storia Antica</i>
<i>AJ</i>	<i>F. F. Abbott and A. C. Johnson, Municipal Administration in the Roman Empire. Princeton, 1926</i>
<i>AJA</i>	<i>American Journal of Archaeology</i>
<i>AJAH</i>	<i>American Journal of Ancient History</i>
<i>AJPb</i>	<i>American Journal of Philology</i>
<i>AMN</i>	<i>Acta Musei Napocensis</i>
<i>AncSoc</i>	<i>Ancient Society</i>
<i>AncW</i>	<i>Ancient World</i>
<i>Annales (ESC)</i>	<i>Annales (Économies, Sociétés, Civilisations)</i>
<i>AnnNYAcSc</i>	<i>Annual of the New York Academy of Sciences</i>
<i>ANRW</i>	<i>H. Temporini, W. Haase (eds.), Aufstieg und Niedergang der römischen Welt. Geschichte und Kultur Roms im Spiegel der neueren Forschung. Berlin and New York, 1972—</i>
<i>ANSMN</i>	<i>American Numismatic Society: Museum Notes</i>
<i>AntAfr</i>	<i>Antiquités africaines</i>
<i>AntClass</i>	<i>Antiquité classique</i>
<i>Antiq</i>	<i>Antiquity</i>
<i>AntJ</i>	<i>Antiquaries Journal</i>
<i>AR</i>	<i>Africa romana</i>

<i>ArchAnz</i>	<i>Archäologischer Anzeiger</i>
<i>ArchCant</i>	<i>Archaeologia Cantiana</i>
<i>ArchClass</i>	<i>Archaeologia Classica</i>
<i>ArchDelt</i>	<i>Ἀρχαιολογικὸν Δελτίον</i>
<i>ArchEpb</i>	<i>Ἀρχαιολογικὴ Ἐφημερίς</i>
<i>ArchErt</i>	<i>Archaeologiai Ertesitő</i>
<i>ArchJ</i>	<i>Archaeologiai Journal</i>
<i>Arh Vestnik</i>	<i>Arheološki Vestnik</i>
<i>ARID</i>	<i>Analecta Romana Instituti Danici</i>
<i>ASAA</i>	<i>Annuario della Scuola Archeologica di Atene e delle Missioni Italiane in Oriente</i>
<i>AW</i>	<i>Antike Welt</i>
BAR	British Archaeological Reports, British Series
BAR s	British Archaeological Reports, International Series
<i>BASOR</i>	<i>Bulletin of the American Schools of Oriental Research</i>
<i>BASP</i>	<i>Bulletin of the American Society of Papyrologists</i>
<i>BCAR</i>	<i>Bullettino della Commissione Archeologica Comunale in Roma</i>
<i>BCH</i>	<i>Bulletin de correspondance hellénique</i>
<i>BCTH</i>	<i>Bulletin archéologique du comité des travaux historiques</i>
<i>BdArch</i>	<i>Bolletino di Archeologia</i>
<i>BEFAR</i>	<i>Bibliothèque des écoles françaises d'Athènes et de Rome</i>
<i>BLAL</i>	<i>Bulletin of the Institute of Archaeology of the University of London</i>
<i>BIBR</i>	<i>Bulletin de l'institut historique belge de Rome</i>
<i>BICS</i>	<i>Bulletin of the Institute of Classical Studies, University of London</i>
<i>BJ</i>	<i>Bonner Jahrbücher</i>
<i>BMB</i>	<i>Bulletin du Musée de Beyrouth</i>
<i>BMCRE I</i>	<i>H. Mattingly, Coins of the Roman Empire in the British Museum, I: Augustus to Vitellius. London, 1923</i>
<i>BMCRE II</i>	<i>H. Mattingly, Coins of the Roman Empire in the British Museum, II: Vespasian to Domitian. London, 1930</i>
<i>BRGK</i>	<i>Bericht der Römisch-Germanischen Kommission des Deutschen Archäologischen Instituts</i>
<i>BSA</i>	<i>Annual of the British School at Athens</i>
<i>BSAO</i>	<i>Bulletin de la société des antiquaires de l'Ouest</i>
<i>BSNAF</i>	<i>Bulletin de la société nationale des antiquaires de France</i>
<i>BullHistMed</i>	<i>Bulletin of the History of Medicine</i>
<i>ByzSt</i>	<i>Byzantine Studies</i>
<i>CAH</i>	<i>The Cambridge Ancient History</i>
<i>CBA ResRep</i>	<i>Council for British Archaeology, Research Reports</i>
<i>CE</i>	<i>Chronique d'Égypte</i>
<i>CJ</i>	<i>Classical Journal</i>
<i>ClAnt</i>	<i>Classical Antiquity</i>
<i>C&M</i>	<i>Classica et Mediaevalia</i>
<i>CPb</i>	<i>Classical Philology</i>
<i>CQ</i>	<i>Classical Quarterly</i>
<i>CR</i>	<i>Classical Review</i>
<i>CRAI</i>	<i>Comptes rendus de l'Académie des inscriptions et belles-lettres</i>

<i>CT</i>	<i>Les Cahiers de Tunisie</i>
<i>CV</i>	<i>Classical Views</i> [= <i>EMC</i>]
<i>DaM</i>	<i>Damascener Mitteilungen</i>
<i>DarSag</i>	C. Daremberg and E. Saglio, <i>Dictionnaire des antiquités grecques et romaines d'après les textes et les monuments</i> . Paris, 1875–1917
<i>DE</i>	E. de Ruggiero, <i>Dizionario epigraphico di antichità romana</i> . Rome, 1895–1988
<i>DHA</i>	<i>Dialogues d'histoire ancienne</i>
<i>DUJ</i>	<i>Durham University Journal</i>
<i>EA</i>	<i>Epigraphica Anatolica</i>
<i>EconHistRev</i>	<i>Economic History Review</i>
<i>EE</i>	<i>Ephemera Epigraphica. Corporis inscriptionum Latinarum supplementum, edita iussu Instituti Archaeologici Romani</i> . Berlin, 1872–9; 1903–13
<i>EJ</i> ²	V. Ehrenberg, A. H. M. Jones, <i>Documents Illustrating the Reigns of Augustus and Tiberius</i> . 2nd edn. Oxford, 1975
<i>EMC</i>	<i>Echos du monde classique</i> [= <i>CV</i>]
<i>EPRO</i>	<i>Etudes préliminaires aux religions orientales dans l'empire romain</i>
<i>EpStud</i>	<i>Epigraphische Studien</i>
<i>ESAR</i>	T. Frank <i>et al.</i> , <i>An Economic Survey of Ancient Rome</i> . 5 vols. Baltimore, 1933–40
<i>EtudClass</i>	<i>Etudes classiques</i>
<i>FIRA</i>	S. Riccobono <i>et al.</i> , <i>Fontes Iuris Romani Antejustiniani</i>
<i>G&R</i>	<i>Greece and Rome</i>
<i>GRBS</i>	<i>Greek, Roman and Byzantine Studies</i>
<i>HBES</i>	<i>Heidelberger althistorische Beiträge und epigraphische Studien</i>
<i>HistTechnol</i>	<i>History of Technology</i>
<i>HSCP</i>	<i>Harvard Studies in Classical Philology</i>
<i>HTR</i>	<i>Harvard Theological Review</i>
<i>HUCA</i>	<i>Hebrew Union College Annual</i>
<i>IA</i>	<i>Iranica Antiqua</i>
<i>IG</i>	A. Kirchhoff <i>et al.</i> , <i>Inscriptiones Graecae</i> . Berlin, 1873–
<i>IGLS</i>	L. Jalabert, R. Mouterde <i>et al.</i> , <i>Inscriptions grecques et latines de la Syrie</i> . Beirut, Paris, 1929–82
<i>IJ</i>	<i>Irish Jurist</i>
<i>IJNA</i>	<i>International Journal of Nautical Archaeology</i>
<i>IndustrArchRev</i>	<i>Industrial Archaeology Review</i>
<i>IstMitt</i>	<i>Istanbuler Mitteilungen, Mitteilungen des Deutschen Archäologischen Instituts, Abteilung Istanbul</i>
<i>JARCE</i>	<i>Journal of the American Research Center in Egypt</i>
<i>JbAC</i>	<i>Jahrbuch für Antike und Christentum</i>
<i>JBL</i>	<i>Journal of Biblical Literature</i>
<i>JDAI</i>	<i>Jahrbuch des Deutschen Archäologischen Instituts</i>
<i>JHM</i>	<i>Journal of the History of Medicine and Allied Sciences</i>
<i>JJP</i>	<i>Journal of Juristic Papyrology</i>
<i>JJS</i>	<i>Journal of Jewish Studies</i>
<i>JLPeasStud</i>	<i>Journal of Peasant Studies</i>
<i>JNG</i>	<i>Jahrbuch für Numismatik und Geldgeschichte</i>

<i>JÖAI</i>	<i>Jahreshefte des Österreichischen Archäologischen Instituts in Wien. Vienna</i> 1898—
<i>JRA</i>	<i>Journal of Roman Archaeology</i>
<i>JRGZM</i>	<i>Jahrbuch des Römisch-germanischen Zentralmuseums, Mainz</i>
<i>JRoy.Soc.Arts</i>	<i>Journal of the Royal Society of Arts</i>
<i>JRS</i>	<i>Journal of Roman Studies</i>
<i>JS</i>	<i>Journal des savants</i>
<i>JTS</i>	<i>Journal of Theological Studies</i>
<i>LA</i>	<i>Libya Antiqua</i>
<i>LS</i>	<i>Libyan Studies</i>
<i>LTUR</i>	E. M. Steinby (ed.), <i>Lexicon Topographicum urbis Romae. Rome,</i> 1993—
<i>MAAR</i>	<i>Memoirs of the American Academy in Rome</i>
<i>MAL</i>	<i>Memorie dell'Accademia Nazionale dei Lincei, classe di scienze morali e storiche</i>
<i>MBAH</i>	<i>Münsterische Beiträge zur antiken Handelsgeschichte</i>
<i>MDAI(D)</i>	<i>Mitteilungen des Deutschen Archäologischen Instituts (Station Damaskus)</i>
<i>MDAI(R)</i>	<i>Mitteilungen des Deutschen Archäologischen Instituts (Römische Abteilung)</i>
<i>MedhistJourn</i>	<i>Medizinhistorisches Journal</i>
<i>MEFRA</i>	<i>Mélanges de l'École française de Rome, Antiquité</i>
<i>MH</i>	<i>Museum Helveticum</i>
<i>MSAF</i>	<i>Mémoires de la Société nationale des antiquaires de France</i>
<i>MUSJ</i>	<i>Mélanges de l'Université St Joseph</i>
<i>MW</i>	M. McCrum and A. G. Woodhead, <i>Select Documents of the Principates of the Flavian Emperors. Cambridge, 1961</i>
<i>NC</i>	<i>Numismatic Chronicle</i>
<i>NSc</i>	<i>Notizie degli Scavi di Antichità</i>
<i>OJA</i>	<i>Oxford Journal of Archaeology</i>
<i>OpInstRomFin</i>	<i>Opuscula Instituti Romani Finlandiae</i>
<i>ORom</i>	<i>Opuscula Romana: Acta Instituti Regni Sueciae</i>
<i>PBA</i>	<i>Proceedings of the British Academy</i>
<i>PBSR</i>	<i>Papers of the British School at Rome</i>
<i>PCPhS</i>	<i>Proceedings of the Cambridge Philological Society</i>
<i>PIR</i>	E. Klebs <i>et al.</i> , <i>Prosopographia Imperii Romani. Berlin 1897–8; E. Groag et al.</i> , 2nd edn, 1933—
<i>PP</i>	<i>La parola del passato</i>
<i>P&P</i>	<i>Past and Present</i>
<i>QAL</i>	<i>Quaderni di Archeologia della Libya</i>
<i>QTic</i>	<i>Quaderni Ticinesi</i>
<i>RA</i>	<i>Revue archéologique</i>
<i>RAAN</i>	<i>Rendiconti dell'Accademia di Archeologia, Lettere e Belle Arti di Napoli</i>
<i>RAC</i>	<i>Revue archéologique du centre de la France consacrée aux antiquités nationales de Auvergne etc.</i>
<i>RAE</i>	<i>Revue archéologique de l'Est et du Centre-Est</i>
<i>RAN</i>	<i>Revue archéologique de Narbonnaise</i>
<i>RAO</i>	<i>Revue archéologique de l'Ouest</i>
<i>RB</i>	<i>Revue biblique</i>

<i>RE</i>	A. F. von Pauly <i>et al.</i> , <i>Real-Encyclopädie der klassischen Altertumswissenschaft</i> , 83 vols. Stuttgart, 1894–1980
<i>REA</i>	<i>Revue des études anciennes</i>
<i>RecSocBodin</i>	<i>Recueil de la Société Bodin</i>
<i>REG</i>	<i>Revue des études grecques</i>
<i>REL</i>	<i>Revue des études latines</i>
<i>RendLinc</i>	<i>Rendiconti dell'Accademia nazionale dei Lincei</i>
<i>RFIC</i>	<i>Rivista di Filologia e di Istruzione Classica</i>
<i>RH</i>	<i>Revue historique</i>
<i>RHD</i>	<i>Revue d'histoire du droit</i> (= <i>Tijdschrift voor Rechtsgeschiedenis</i>)
<i>RHDFE</i>	<i>Revue historique de droit français et étranger</i>
<i>RbM</i>	<i>Rheinisches Museum für Philologie</i>
<i>RHPbR</i>	<i>Revue d'histoire et de philosophie religieuses</i>
<i>RHR</i>	<i>Revue de l'histoire des religions</i>
<i>RIB I</i>	R. G. Collingwood, R. P. Wright, <i>Roman Inscriptions of Britain I, Inscriptions on stone</i> . Oxford, 1965
<i>RIB II</i>	R. G. Collingwood, R. P. Wright, S. S. Frere, R. S. O. Tomlin (eds.) <i>Roman Inscriptions of Britain II, Instrumentum domesticum fascicules 1–8</i> . Gloucester, 1990–5
<i>RIC I–III</i>	H. Mattingley and E. A. Sydenham, <i>The Roman Imperial Coinage 1–III</i> . London, 1923–30
<i>RIC 1²</i>	C. H. V. Sutherland and R. A. G. Carson, <i>The Roman Imperial Coinage 1</i> . 2nd edn. London, 1984
<i>RIDA</i>	<i>Revue internationale des droits de l'antiquité</i>
<i>RivStudi Lig</i>	<i>Rivista di Studi Liguri</i>
<i>ROMM</i>	<i>Revue de l'Occident musulman et de la Méditerranée</i>
<i>RPAA</i>	<i>Rendiconti della Pontificia Accademia Romana di Archeologia</i>
<i>RPh</i>	<i>Revue de Philologie</i>
<i>RSA</i>	<i>Rivista storica dell'antichità</i>
<i>RSC</i>	<i>Rivista di studi classici</i>
<i>RSI</i>	<i>Rivista storica italiana</i>
<i>SCI</i>	<i>Scripta Classica Israelica</i>
<i>SCO</i>	<i>Studi Classici e Orientali</i>
<i>SDHI</i>	<i>Studia et documenta historiae et iuris</i>
<i>SIFC</i>	<i>Studi Italiani di Filologia Classica</i>
Smallwood, GCN	E. M. Smallwood, <i>Documents Illustrating the Principates of Gaius, Claudius and Nero</i> . Cambridge, 1967
Smallwood, NTH	E. M. Smallwood, <i>Documents Illustrating the Principates of Nerva, Trajan and Hadrian</i> . Cambridge, 1966
<i>SNR</i>	<i>Schweizerische Numismatische Rundschau</i>
<i>TAPA</i>	<i>Transactions of the American Philological Association</i>
<i>TAPhS</i>	<i>Transactions of the American Philosophical Society</i>
<i>TG</i>	<i>Tijdschrift voor Geschiedenis</i>
<i>TZ</i>	<i>Trierer Zeitschrift</i>
<i>World Arch</i>	<i>World Archaeology</i>
<i>YCS</i>	<i>Yale Classical Studies</i>
<i>ZA</i>	<i>Zeitschrift für Archäologie</i>

ZDMG	<i>Zeitschrift der deutschen morgenländischen Gesellschaft</i>
ZDPV	<i>Zeitschrift des deutschen Palästina-Vereins</i>
ZPE	<i>Zeitschrift für Papyrologie und Epigraphik</i>
ZRG	<i>Zeitschrift der Savigny-Stiftung für Rechtsgeschichte</i>

FREQUENTLY CITED WORKS

- Alcock, *Graecia Capta*. Alcock, S. E. (1993) *Graecia Capta: The Landscapes of Roman Greece*. Cambridge
- Alföldy, *Heeresgeschichte*. Alföldy, G. (1987) *Römische Heeresgeschichte. Beiträge 1962–1985* (Mavors 3). Amsterdam
- Alföldy, *Konsulat*. Alföldy, G. (1977) *Konsulat und Senatorenstand unter den Antoninen. Prosopographische Untersuchungen zur senatorischen Führungsschicht*. Bonn
- Ameling, *Herodes Atticus*. Ameling, W. (1983) *Herodes Atticus. I Biographie; II Inschriftenkatalog* (Subsidia Epigraphica 11). Hildesheim
- Andreau, *Vie financière*. Andreau, J. (1987) *La vie financière dans le monde romain, les métiers de manieurs d'argent (IV^e siècle av. J.-C.-III^e siècle ap. J.-C.)*. Rome
- Barker and Lloyd, *Landscapes*. Barker, G. and Lloyd, J. (eds.) (1991) *Roman Landscapes: Archaeological Survey in the Mediterranean Region* (Archaeological Monographs of the British School at Rome 2). London
- Beard, North and Price, *Religions of Rome*. Beard, M., North, J. and Price, S. (1998) *Religions of Rome*, vol. I: *A History*; vol. II: *A Sourcebook*. Cambridge
- Birley, A. *Marcus Aurelius*. Birley, A. R. (1987) *Marcus Aurelius: A Biography*. 2nd edn. London
- Birley, E. *Army*. Birley, E. (1988) *Roman Army Papers 1929–1986* (Mavors 4). Amsterdam
- Boatwright, *Hadrian*. Boatwright, M. T. (1987) *Hadrian and the City of Rome*. Princeton
- Bowersock, *Sophists*. Bowersock, G. W. (1969) *Greek Sophists in the Roman Empire*. Oxford
- Bowersock, *Arabia*. Bowersock, G. W. (1983) *Roman Arabia*. London and Cambridge, Mass.
- Bowman and Thomas, *Vindolanda I*. Bowman, A. K. and Thomas, J. D. (1983) *Vindolanda: The Latin Writing Tablets* (Britannia Monograph 4). London
- Bowman and Thomas, *Vindolanda II*. Bowman, A. K. and Thomas, J. D. (1994) *The Vindolanda Writing Tablets (Tabulae Vindolandenses II)*. London
- Brunt, *Imperial Themes*. Brunt, P. A. (1990) *Roman Imperial Themes*. Oxford
- Campbell, *Emperor and Army*. Campbell, J. B. (1984) *The Emperor and the Roman Army 31 B.C.-A.D. 235*. Oxford
- Carandini and Ricci, *Settefinestre*. Carandini, A. and Ricci, A. (eds.) (1985) *Settefinestre: una villa schiavistica nell'Etruria romana*. 3 vols. Modena
- Champlin, *Fronto*. Champlin, E. (1980) *Fronto and Antonine Rome*. Cambridge, Mass. and London
- Crook, *Consilium*. Crook, J. (1955) *Consilium Principis. Imperial Councils and Counsellors from Augustus to Diocletian*. Cambridge (= 1975)
- D'Arms, *Commerce*. D'Arms, J. H. (1981) *Commerce and Social Standing in Ancient Rome*. Cambridge, Mass. and London

- D'Arms and Kopff, *Seaborne Commerce*. D'Arms, J. H. and Kopff, E. C. (eds.) (1980) *The Seaborne Commerce of Ancient Rome*. Rome (= *MAAR* 36)
- Dilke, *Surveyors*. Dilke, O. A. W. (1971) *The Roman Land Surveyors: An Introduction to the Agrimensores*. Newton Abbott
- Duncan-Jones, *Economy*. Duncan-Jones, R. (1982) *The Economy of the Roman Empire: Quantitative Studies*. 2nd edn. Cambridge
- Duncan-Jones, *Money*. Duncan-Jones, R. (1994) *Money and Government in the Roman Empire*. Cambridge
- Duncan-Jones, *Structure*. Duncan-Jones, R. (1990) *Structure and Scale in the Roman Economy*. Cambridge
- Durry, *Cohortes*. Durry, M. (1938) *Les cohortes prétoriennes*. Paris
- Eck, *Organisation*. Eck, W. (1979) *Die staatliche Organisation Italiens in der Hohen Kaiserzeit* (Vestigia 28). Munich
- Eck, *Senatoren*. Eck, W. (1970) *Senatoren von Vespasian bis Hadrian: Prosopographische Untersuchungen mit Einschluss der Jahres- und Provinzialfasten der Statthalter* (Vestigia 13). Munich
- Eck, *Verwaltung 1*. Eck, W. (1995) *Die Verwaltung des römischen Reiches in der Hohen Kaiserzeit. Ausgewählte und erweiterte Beiträge. 1. Band*. Basel
- Eck, *Verwaltung 2*. Eck, W. (1998) *Die Verwaltung des römischen Reiches in der Hohen Kaiserzeit. Ausgewählte und erweiterte Beiträge. 2. Band*. Basel
- Fink, *Military Records*. Fink, R. O. (1971) *Roman Military Records on Papyrus* (American Philological Association Monograph 26). Cleveland, Ohio
- Finley, *Ancient Economy*. Finley, M. I. (1985) *The Ancient Economy*. 2nd edn. Berkeley and London
- Finley, *Property*. Finley, M. I. (ed.) (1976) *Studies in Roman Property by the Cambridge University Research Seminar in Ancient History*. Cambridge
- Forni, *Reclutamento*. Forni, G. (1953) *Il reclutamento delle legioni da Augusto a Diocleziano*. Rome
- Frere, *Britannia*. Frere, S. (1987) *Britannia: A History of Roman Britain*. 3rd edn. London
- Garnsey, *Famine*. Garnsey, P. D. A. (1988) *Famine and Food Supply in the Graeco-Roman World: Responses to Risk and Crisis*. Cambridge
- Garnsey and Saller, *Empire*. Garnsey, P. D. A. and Saller, R. (1987) *The Roman Empire: Economy, Society and Culture*. London
- Garnsey and Whittaker, *Imperialism*. Garnsey, P. D. A. and Whittaker, C. R. (eds.) (1978) *Imperialism in the Ancient World*. Cambridge
- Garnsey, Hopkins and Whittaker, *Trade*. Garnsey, P. D. A., Hopkins, K. and Whittaker, C. R. (eds.) (1983) *Trade in the Ancient Economy*. London
- Garzetti, *Tiberius to Antonines*. Garzetti, A. (1974) *From Tiberius to the Antonines: A History of the Roman Empire (14 A.D.–192 A.D.)*. English trans. London
- Giardina and Schiavone, *Società e produzione*. Giardina, A. and Schiavone, S. (eds.) (1981) *Società romana e produzione schiavistica*. Rome and Bari
- Giovannini, *Nourrir*. Giovannini, A. (ed.) (1991) *Nourrir la plèbe. Hommages à D. van Berchem*. Basel
- Golvin, *L'amphithéâtre*. Golvin, J.-C. (1988) *L'amphithéâtre romain: essai sur la théorisation de sa forme et de ses fonctions*. Paris
- Golvin and Landes, *Amphithéâtres*. Golvin, J.-C., and Landes, C. (1990) *Amphithéâtres et gladiateurs*. Paris

- Greene, *Archaeology*. Greene, K. (1986) *The Archaeology of the Roman Economy*. London
- Halfmann, *Itinera*. Halfmann, H. (1986) *Itinera Principum. Geschichte und Typologie der Kaiserreisen im Römischen Reich*. Stuttgart
- Halfmann, *Senatoren*. Halfmann, H. (1979) *Die Senatoren aus dem östlichen Teil des Imperium Romanum bis zum Ende des 2. Jahrhunderts n. Chr.* (Hypomnemata 58) Göttingen
- Hands, *Charities*. Hands, A. R. (1968) *Charities and Social Aid in Greece and Rome*. London
- Hannestadt, *Art*. Hannestadt, N. (1986) *Roman Art and Imperial Policy* (Jutland Archaeological Society). Aarhus
- Harris, *Ancient Literacy*. Harris, W. V. (1989) *Ancient Literacy*. Cambridge, Mass.
- Hirschfeld, *Verwaltungsbeamte*. Hirschfeld, O. (1905) *Die kaiserlichen Verwaltungsbeamten bis auf Diokletian*. 2nd edn. Berlin (3rd edn, 1963)
- Hopkins, *Death and Renewal*. Hopkins, K. (1983) *Death and Renewal* (Sociological Studies in Roman History 2). Cambridge
- Humphrey, *Circuses*. Humphrey, J. (1986) *Roman Circuses, Arenas for Chariot-racing*. London
- Isaac, *Limits*. Isaac, B. (1990) *The Limits of Empire. The Roman Army in the East*. 2nd edn. Oxford
- Jacques, *Privilege*. Jacques, F. (1984) *Le privilège de liberté. Politique impériale et autonomie municipale dans les cités de l'Occident romain (161–244)*. Rome
- Jones, *Cities*. Jones, A. H. M. (1971) *The Cities of the Eastern Roman Provinces*. 2nd edn. Oxford
- Jones, *Greek City*. Jones, A. H. M. (1940) *The Greek City from Alexander to Justinian*. Oxford
- Jones, *Domitian*. Jones, B. W. (1992) *The Emperor Domitian*. London
- Jones, *Titus*. Jones, B. W. (1984) *The Emperor Titus*. London
- Jones, *Dio Chrysostom*. Jones, C. P. (1978) *The Roman World of Dio Chrysostom*. Cambridge, Mass. and London
- Jones, *Plutarch*. Jones, C. P. (1971) *Plutarch and Rome*. Oxford
- Jongman, *Pompeii*. Jongman, W. (1988) *The Economy and Society of Pompeii*. Amsterdam
- Kloft, *Liberalitas*. Kloft, H. (1970) *Liberalitas Principis. Herkunft und Bedeutung. Studien zur Prinzipatsideologie* (Kölner Historische Abhandlungen 18). Cologne
- de Laet, *Portorium*. Laet, S. J. de (1949) *Portorium. Etude sur l'organisation douanière du Haut-Empire*. Bruges
- Lane Fox, *Pagans*. Lane Fox, R. (1986) *Pagans and Christians*. London
- Lepper and Frere, *Trajan's Column*. Lepper, F. and Frere, S. (1988) *Trajan's Column*. Gloucester
- Lewis, Yadin and Greenfield, *Documents of Bar Kokkba*. Lewis, N., Yadin, Y. and Greenfield, J. C. (eds.) (1989) *The Documents from the Bar Kokkba Period in the Cave of Letters. Greek Papyri*. Jerusalem
- de Ligt, *Fairs*. Ligt, L. de (1993) *Fairs and Markets in the Roman Empire: Economic and Social Aspects of Periodic Trade in a Pre-industrial Society*. Amsterdam
- Limeskongress I* (1952) *The Congress of Roman Frontier Studies, 1949*, ed. E. Birley. Durham
- Limeskongress II* (1956) *Carnuntina. Ergebnisse der Forschung über die Grenzprovinzen des*

- römischen Reiches, 1955 (Römische Forschungen in Niederösterreich 3), ed. E. Swoboda. Graz
- Limeskongress III* (1959) *Limes-Studien: Vorträge des 3. Internationalen Limes-Kongresses in Rheinfelden/Basel, 1957* (Schriften des Institutes für Ur- und Frühgeschichte der Schweiz 14), ed. R. Laur-Belart. Basel
- Limeskongress V* (1963) *Quintus congressus internationalis limitis Romani studiosorum, 1961* (Arheoloski Radovi i Rasprave 3). Zagreb
- Limeskongress VI* (1967) *Studien zu den Militärgrenzen Roms: Vorträge des 6. Internationalen Limeskongresses in Süddeutschland* (BJ 19). Cologne and Graz
- Limeskongress VII* (1970) *Roman Frontier Studies: The Proceedings of the 7th International Congress, Tel Aviv 1967*, ed. S. Applebaum. Tel Aviv
- Limeskongress VIII* (1974) *Roman Frontier Studies: 8th International Congress of Limesforschung, Cardiff 1969*, ed. E. Birley, B. Dobson and M. Jarrett. Cardiff
- Limeskongress IX* (1974) *Actes du IXe congrès international d'études sur les frontières romaines. Mamaia 1972*. Cologne, Vienna and Bucharest
- Limeskongress X* (1977) *Studien zu den Militärgrenzen Roms II. Vorträge des 10. internationalen Limeskongresses in der Germania Inferior*. Cologne and Bonn
- Limeskongress XI* (1977) *Limes. Akten des XI internationalen Limeskongresses* (Székesfehérvár, 30.8–6.9.1976), ed. J. Fitz. Budapest
- Limeskongress XII* (1980) *Roman Frontier Studies XII, 1979*, ed. W. S. Hanson and L. J. F. Keppie (BAR 571). Oxford
- Limeskongress XIII* (1986) *Studien zu den Militärgrenzen Roms III. 13. Internationaler Limeskongress, Aalen 1983: Vorträge* (Forschungen und Berichte zur Vor- und Frühgeschichte in Baden-Württemberg 20). Stuttgart
- Limeskongress XIV* (1990) *Akten des 14. Internationalen Limeskongresses 1986 in Carnuntum (Der römische Limes in Österreich, 36/1–2)*, ed. H. Vetters and M. Kandler. Vienna
- Limeskongress XV* (1991) *Roman Frontier Studies, 1989. Proceedings of the XVth International Congress of Roman Frontier Studies*, ed. V. A. Maxfield and M. J. Dobson. Exeter
- Limeskongress XVI* (1997) *Roman Frontier Studies, 1995. Proceedings of the XVIth International Congress of Roman Frontier Studies*, ed. W. Groenman-van Waateringe et al. Oxford
- MacMullen, *Social Relations*. MacMullen, R. (1974) *Roman Social Relations, 50 B.C. to A.D. 284*. New Haven and London
- Mann, *Recruitment*. Mann, J. C. (1983) *Legionary Recruitment and Veteran Settlement during the Principate*, ed. M. M. Roxan (Institute of Archaeology Occasional Publication 7). London
- Meiggs, *Ostia*. Meiggs, R. (1973) *Roman Ostia*. 2nd edn. Oxford
- Millar, *Emperor*. Millar, F. G. B. (1977) *The Emperor in the Roman World* (31 B.C.–A.D. 337). London (2nd edn, 1992)
- Millar, *Near East*. Millar, F. (1993) *The Roman Near East* (31 B.C.–A.D. 337). London
- Mitchell, *Anatolia*. Mitchell, S. (1993) *Anatolia: Land, Men and Gods in Asia Minor*. 2 vols. Oxford
- Mommsen, *Römisches Staatsrecht*. Mommsen, T. (1887) *Römisches Staatsrecht*. Leipzig
- Neesen, *Staatsabgaben*. Neesen, L. (1980) *Untersuchungen zu den direkten Staatsabgaben der römischen Kaiserzeit* (27 v. Chr.–284 n. Chr.). Bonn
- Oppositions et résistances à l'Empire romain d'Auguste à Trajan* (1987). Geneva

- Panciera, *Epigrafia*. Panciera, S. (ed.) (1982 [1984]) *Epigrafia ed ordine senatorio: Atti del colloquio internazionale AIEGL, Roma, 14-20 maggio 1981*. 2 vols. Rome
- Passerini, *Le coorti pretorie*. Passerini, A. (1949) *Le coorti pretorie*. Rome
- Pavis d'Escurac, *Préfecture*. Pavis d'Escurac, H. (1976) *La préfecture de l'annone. Service administratif impérial d'Auguste à Constantin*. Paris
- Pflaum, *Carrières*. Pflaum, H.-G. (1960-1, 1982) *Les carrières procuratoriennes équestres sous le Haut-Empire romain*. Paris; Suppl. Paris, 1982
- Pflaum, *Procurateurs*. Pflaum, H.-G. (1950) *Les procurateurs équestres sous le Haut-Empire romain*. Paris
- Potter, *Landscape*. Potter, T. W. (1979) *The Changing Landscape of South Etruria*. London
- Price, *Rituals*. Price, S. R. F. (1984) *Rituals and Power: The Imperial Cult in Asia Minor*. Cambridge
- Rathbone, *Economic Rationalism*. Rathbone, D. (1991) *Economic Rationalism and Rural Society in Third-Century A.D. Egypt: The Heroninos Archive and the Appianus Estate*. Cambridge
- Reynolds, *Aphrodisias*. Reynolds, J. (1982) *Aphrodisias and Rome* (JRS Monographs 1). London
- Rickman, *Corn Supply*. Rickman, G. E. (1980) *The Corn Supply of Ancient Rome*. Oxford
- Rostovtzeff, *SEHRE*. Rostovtzeff, M. (1926) *The Social and Economic History of the Roman Empire*. Oxford; rev. by P. M. Fraser, 2nd edn, 1957
- Roxan, *Diplomas I*. Roxan, M. M. (1978) *Roman Military Diplomas, 1954-1977* (Institute of Archaeology, Occasional Papers 2). London
- Roxan, *Diplomas II*. Roxan, M. M. (1985) *Roman Military Diplomas, 1978-1984* (Institute of Archaeology, Occasional Papers 9). London
- Roxan, *Diplomas III*. Roxan, M. M. (1994) *Roman Military Diplomas, 1985-1993* (Institute of Archaeology, Occasional Papers 14). London
- Ste Croix, *Class Struggle*. Ste Croix, G. E. M. de (1981) *The Class Struggle in the Ancient Greek World*. London
- Saller, *Patronage*. Saller, R. (1982) *Personal Patronage under the Early Empire*. Cambridge
- Schürer, *Jewish People*. Schürer, E. (1973-87) *The History of the Jewish People in the Age of Jesus Christ*. Revised by G. Vermes, F. Millar, M. Black and M. Goodman. 3 vols. Edinburgh. (I: 1973; II: 1979; III.1: 1986; III.2: 1987)
- Sherwin-White, *Citizenship*. Sherwin-White, A. N. (1973) *The Roman Citizenship*. 2nd edn. Oxford
- Sherwin-White, *Letters of Pliny*. Sherwin-White, A. N. (1966) *The Letters of Pliny: A Historical and Social Commentary*. Oxford
- Smallwood, *Jews*. Smallwood, E. M. (1976) *The Jews under Roman Rule from Pompey to Diocletian*. Leiden
- Spurr, *Arable Cultivation*. Spurr, M. (1986) *Arable Cultivation in Roman Italy, c. 200 B.C.-c. A.D. 100* (JRS Monograph 3) London
- Starr, *Imperial Navy*. Starr, C. G. (1941) *The Roman Imperial Navy*. Ithaca
- Syme, *Danubian Papers*. Syme, R. (1971) *Danubian Papers*. Bucharest
- Syme, *Roman Papers*. Syme, R. (1979-91) *Roman Papers I-VII*, ed. E. Badian, vols. I-II (1979); ed A. R. Birley, vols. III (1984), IV-V (1988), VI-VII (1991). Oxford
- Syme, *Tacitus*. Syme, R. (1958) *Tacitus*. Oxford
- Talbert, *Senate*. Talbert, R. J. A. (1984) *The Senate of Imperial Rome*. Princeton

- Tchernia, *Vin*. Tchernia, A. (1986) *Le vin de l'Italie romaine: essai d'histoire économique d'après les amphores*. Rome
- Temporini, *Frauen*. Temporini, H. (1978) *Die Frauen am Hofe Traians, ein Beitrag zur Stellung der Augustae im Prinzipat*. Berlin and New York
- Thomasson, *Laterculi Praesidum*. Thomasson, B. (1975–90) *Laterculi Praesidum* I–III. Gothenburg
- Tomlinson, *Mycenae to Constantinople*. Tomlinson, R. (1992) *From Mycenae to Constantinople, The Evolution of the Ancient City*. London and New York
- Veyne, *Pain et cirque*. Veyne, P. (1976) *Le pain et le cirque*. Paris
- Wallace-Hadrill, *Patronage*. Wallace-Hadrill, A. (ed.) (1989) *Patronage in Ancient Society*. London
- Weaver, *Familia Caesaris*. Weaver, P. R. C. (1972) *Familia Caesaris*. Cambridge
- Wiedemann, *Emperors and Gladiators*. Wiedemann, T. E. J. (1992) *Emperors and Gladiators*. London and New York
- Whittaker, *Frontiers*. Whittaker, C. R. (1994) *Frontiers of the Roman Empire*. Baltimore and London
- Wightman, *Gallia Belgica*. Wightman, E. M. (1985) *Gallia Belgica*. London
- Wörrle, *Stadt und Fest*. Wörrle, M. (1988) *Stadt und Fest in kaiserzeitlichen Kleinasien: Studien zu einer agonistischen Stiftung aus Oinoanda*. Munich (English trans. of the text by S. Mitchell, *JRS* 80 (1990) 183–91)

PART I: NARRATIVE (CHS. 1–3)

- Adamietz, J. von (1986) 'Quintilian's Institutio Oratoria', *ANRW* II 32.4: 2226–71
- Alföldi, A. and Alföldi, E. (1976) *Kontorniat-Medaillons*. Berlin
- Alföldy, G. (1969) *Fasti Hispanienses. Senatorische Reichsbeamte und Offiziere in den spanischen Provinzen von Augustus bis Diokletian*. Wiesbaden
- Alföldy, G. (1989) *Die Krise des römischen Reiches. Geschichte, Geschichtsschreibung und Geschichtsbetrachtung. Ausgewählte Beiträge*. Stuttgart
- Alföldy, G. and Halfmann, H. (1979) 'Iunius Mauricus und die Victoria Parthica', *ZPE* 35: 195–212
- Anderson, J. C. (1983) 'A topographical tradition in the fourth-century chronicles: Domitian's building programme', *Historia* 32: 93–105
- Angeli, S. de (1992) *Templum Divi Vespasiani*. Rome
- Applebaum, S. (1976) *Prolegomena to the Study of the Second Jewish Revolt A.D. 132–135* (BAR 57). Oxford
- Astarita, M. L. (1983) *Avidio Cassio*. Rome
- Bannert, H. (1977) 'Der Tod des Kaisers Marcus', in *Latinität und alte Kirche. Festschrift R. Hanslik (Wiener Studien Beih. 8)* (Vienna) 9–16
- Baradez, J. (1949) *Fossatum Africae*. Algiers
- Barnes, T. D. (1967) 'Hadrian and Lucius Verus', *JRS* 57: 65–79
- Barnes, T. D. (1975) 'The embassy of Athenagoras', *JTS* 26: 111–14
- Barnes, T. D. (1978) *The Sources of the Historia Augusta* (Collection Latomus 155). Brussels
- Barnes, T. D. (1981) 'Curiatius Maternus', *Hermes* 109: 382 ff.
- Barnes, T. D. (1989) 'Emperors on the move', *JRA* 2: 247–61
- Bennett, J. (1997) *Trajan Optimus Princeps*. London and New York

- Will, E. L. (1984) 'Ähnlichkeiten zwischen Stempeln auf Amphoren und auf arretinischen Gefässen', *Acta RCRF* 23–4: 9–11
- Williams, D. F. and Peacock, D. P. S. (1983) 'The importation of olive-oil into Iron Age and Roman Britain', in *Producción y comercio del aceite en la antigüedad. Segundo congreso internacional* (Madrid) 263–80
- Williamson, C. (1987) 'A Roman law from Narbonne', *Athenaeum* 65: 173–89
- Wilmott, T. and Rahtz, S. P. Q. (1985) 'An iron age and Roman settlement outside Kenchester (Magnis), Herefordshire: excavations 1977–1979', *Transactions of Woolhope Naturalists' Field Club* 45: 36–185
- Wipszycka, E. (1965) *L'industrie textile dans l'Égypte romaine*. Wrocław
- Wissemann, M. (1984) 'Die Spezialisierung des römischen Handels', *MBAH* 3, 1: 116–24
- Wolf, J. G. (1979) 'Aus den neuem pompejanischen Urkundenfund: der Seefrachtvertrag des Menelaos', *Freiburger Universitätsblätter* 18: 23–36
- Wolters, R. (1990 and 1991) 'Zum Waren- und Dienstleistungsaustausch zwischen dem Römischen Reich und dem Freien Germanien in der Zeit des Prinzipats. Eine Bestandsaufnahme', *MBAH* 9, 1: 14–44 and 10, 1: 78–132
- Wood, J. W. (1990) 'Fertility in anthropological populations', *Annual Review of Anthropology* 10: 211–42
- Woods, A. (1987) 'Mining', in J. Wachter (ed.), *The Roman World* 11 (London) 611–34
- Woolf, G. (1990) 'Food, poverty and patronage: the significance of the epigraphy of the Roman alimentary schemes in early imperial Italy', *PBSR* 45: 197–228
- Wrigley, E. A. and Schofield, R. S. (1989) *A Population History of England, 1541–1871: A Reconstruction*. Rev. pb. edn. Cambridge, Mass. (first published 1981)
- Yeo, C. A. (1951–2) 'The economies of Roman and American slavery', *Finanzarchiv* 13: 445–85
- Young, C. J. (1977) *The Roman Pottery Industry of the Oxford Region* (BAR 43). Oxford
- Youtie, H. C. (1975) 'Apatores: law vs. custom in Roman Egypt', in *Hommages à C. Préaux* (Brussels) 723–40
- Zimmer, G. (1983) *Römische Berufsdarstellungen* (Archäologische Forschungen 12). Berlin

PART VB ART AND CULTURE (CHS. 30–5)

- Abou-Aly, A. M. (1992) 'The medical writings of Rufus of Ephesus', Diss., London
- Al-Walda, H. (1986) 'Sculpture in Libya during the Roman period'. Diss., London
- Alföldi, A. (1934) 'Die Ausgestaltung des monarchischen Zeremoniells am römischen Kaiserhof', *MDAI(R)* 49: 1–118 (= *Die monarchische Repräsentation im römischen Kaiserreiche*, Darmstadt 1970)
- Alföldi, G. (1984) *Römische Statuen in Venetia et Histria. Epigraphische Quellen*. Heidelberg
- Amundsen, D. W. (1982) 'Medicine and faith in early Christianity', *BullHistMed.* 56: 326–48
- Anderson, G. (1986) *Philostratus*. London
- Anderson, G. (1989) 'The *pepaideumenos* in action: sophists and their outlook in the early empire', *ANRW* 11 33.1: 79–208

- Anderson, G. (1990) 'The second sophistic: some problems of perspective', in Russell (1990a) 91-110
- Anderson, G. (1993) *The Second Sophistic*. London
- André, J. M. (1987) 'Les écoles philosophiques aux deux premiers siècles de l'Empire', *ANRW* II 36.1: 5-77
- Andreae, B. (1978) *The Art of Rome*. London
- Andreae, B. (1981) 'Bibliographie zur Sarkophagforschung nach Rodenwaldt 1945-1980', *ANRW* II 12.2: 3-64
- Andreau, J. (1974) *Les affaires de Monsieur Jucundus* (Collection de l'Ecole française de Rome 19) (Rome)
- Andreau, J. (1977) 'Fondations privées et rapports sociaux en Italie romaine', *Ktèma* 2: 157-209
- Andrei, O. (1984) *A. Claudius Charax di Pergamo: interessi antiquari e antichità cittadine nell'età degli Antonini*. Bologna
- Andresen, C. (1955) *Logos und Nomos*. Berlin
- Arafat, K. W. (1996) *Pausanias' Greece: Ancient Artists and Roman Rulers*. Cambridge
- Armstrong, A. H. (ed.) (1970) *The Cambridge History of Later Greek and Early Mediaeval Philosophy*. Cambridge
- Arnold, E. V. (1911) *Roman Stoicism*. Cambridge
- Attridge, H. W. (1978) 'Philosophical critique of religion', *ANRW* II 6.1: 45-78
- Audollent, A. (1904) *Defixionum Tabellae*. Paris
- Avotins, I. (1975) 'The holders of the chairs of rhetoric at Athens', *HSCP* 79: 313-23
- Balla, L. (1967) 'Zur Geschichte des religiösen Lebens von Savaria', *Acta Classica Universitatis Scientiarum Debreceniensis* 3: 67-76
- Balty, J. (1981a) 'La mosaïque antique au Proche-Orient, 1. Des origines à la Tétrarchie', *ANRW* II 12.2: 347-429
- Balty, J. (1981b) 'L'oracle et Apamée', *AC* 50: 5-14
- Bara, J.-F. (1989) *Vettius Valens d'Antioche, Anthologies, Livre I, Etablissement, traduction et commentaire (EPRO 3)*. Leiden
- Barigazzi, A. (1966) *Favorino di Arelate: Opere*. Florence
- Barnes, J. (1981) *Constantine and Eusebius*. Cambridge, Mass. and London
- Barnes, J. (1989) 'Antiochus of Ascalon', in Griffin and Barnes (1989) 51-96
- Barnes, J. (1990) *The Toils of Scepticism*. Cambridge
- Barnes, J. (1991) 'Galen on logic and therapy', in F. Kudlien and R. J. Durling (eds.), *Galen's Method of Healing (Leiden)* 50-102
- Barrow, R. H. (1967) *Plutarch and his Times*. London
- Barton, S. C. and Horsley, G. H. R. (1981) 'A Hellenistic cult group and New Testament churches', *JbAC* 24: 7-41
- Beard, W. M. (1985) 'Writing and ritual: a study of diversity and expansion in the Arval Acta', *PBSR* 53: 114-62
- Beard, W. M. (1990) 'Priesthood in the Roman Republic', in Beard and North (1990) 19-48
- Beard, W. M. (1991) 'Ancient Literacy and the function of the written word in Roman religion', in Humphrey (1991) 35-58
- Beard, M. and North, J. (eds.) (1990) *Pagan Priests*. London
- Beaujeu, J. (1955) *La religion romaine à l'apogée de l'empire, 1, La politique religieuse des Antonines*. Paris

- Becatti, G. (1954) *Scavi di Ostia*, II.1, *Mitrei*. Rome
- Becatti, G. (1982) 'La Colonna Traiana, espressione somma del rilievo storico romano', *ANRW* II 12.1: 536–78
- Beck, R. (1984) 'Mithraism since Franz Cumont', *ANRW* II 17.4: 2002–115
- Beck, R. (1994) 'In the place of the lion: Mithras in the Tauroctony', in Hinnells (1994) 29–50
- Behr, C. A. (1968) *Aelius Aristides and the Sacred Tales*. Amsterdam
- Benedum, J. (1971) 'Statilios Attalos', *Med-histJourn* 6: 264–77
- Benoit, A., Philonenko, M. and Vogel, C. (eds.) (1978) *Paganisme, Judaïsme, Christianisme. Mélanges offerts à Marcel Simon*. Paris
- Bergman, J. (1968) *Ich bin Isis. Studien zum memphitischen Hintergrund der griechischen Isisareologie*. Uppsala
- Bergmann, M. and Zanker, P. (1981) "'Damnatio memoriae". Umgearbeitete Nero- und Domitiansporträts. Zur Ikonographie der flavischen Kaiser und des Nerva', *JDAI* 96: 317
- Bernoulli, J. J. (1882–94) *Römische Ikonographie*. Stuttgart
- Beskow, P. (1980) 'The portorium and the mysteries of Mithras', *Journal of Mithraic Studies* 3: 1–18
- Best, E. E. (1966–7) 'The literate Roman soldier', *CJ* 62: 122–7
- Betz, H. D. (1986) *The Greek Magical Papyri including the Demotic Spells*, 1. Chicago
- Bidez, J. and Cumont, F. (1938) *Les mages hellénisés, Zoroastre, Ostanès et Hytaspès, d'après la traduction grecque*. Paris
- Bieber, M. (1977) *Ancient Copies: Contributions to the History of Greek and Roman Art*. New York
- Bingen, J. ed. (1996) *Pausanias historien* (Entretiens Hardt 41). Geneva
- Birley, E. (1978) 'The religion of the Roman army, 1895–1977', *ANRW* II 16.2: 1506–41
- Biró, M. (1975) 'The inscriptions of Roman Britain', *AArchHung* 27: 13–57
- Blagg, T. F. C. (1981) 'Architectural patronage in the western provinces of the Roman Empire in the third century', in A. King and M. Henig (eds.), *The Roman West in the Third Century* (Oxford) 167–88
- Bodson, A. (1967) *La morale sociale des derniers stoïciens: Sénèque, Épictète et Marc-Aurèle*. Paris
- Boemer, F. (1957–63) *Untersuchungen über die Religion der Sklaven in Griechenland und Rom*. Mainz
- Bol, R. (1984) *Das Statuenprogramm des Herodes-Atticus-Nymphäums* (Deutsches Archäologisches Institut, Olympische Forschungen xv). Berlin
- Bonhoeffer, D. (1890) *Epiktet und die Stoa*. Stuttgart
- Bonhoeffer, D. (1894) *Die Ethik der Stoiker Epiktet*. Stuttgart
- Bosworth, A. B. (1980) *A Historical Commentary on Arrian's History of Alexander* I. Oxford
- Bowersock, G. W. (1990) *Hellenism in Late Antiquity*. Michigan and Cambridge
- Bowie, E. L. (1970) 'Greeks and their past in the second sophistic', *P&P* 46: 3–41 (= with revisions in M. I. Finley (ed.), *Studies in Ancient Society* (London, 1974) 166–209)
- Bowie, E. L. (1978) 'Apollonius of Tyana: tradition and reality', *ANRW* II 16.2: 1652–99

- Bowie, E. L. (1982) 'The importance of sophists', *YCS* 27: 29–59
- Bowie, E. L. (1989a) 'Greek sophists and Greek poetry', *ANRW* II 33.1: 209–58
- Bowie, E. L. (1989b) 'Poetry and poets in Asia and Achaea', in A. Cameron and S. Walker (eds.), *The Greek Renaissance in the Roman Empire* (Papers from the Xth British Museum Classical Colloquium, *BICS* Suppl. 55) (London) 198–205
- Bowie, E. L. (1990) 'Greek poetry in the Antonine Age', in Russell (1990a) 53–90
- Bowie, E. L. (1994) 'The readership of Greek novels in the ancient world', in James Tatum (ed.), *The Search for the Ancient Novel* (Baltimore and London) 435–59
- Bowie, E. L. (1996) 'The ancient readers of the Greek novels', in Schmeling, G. (ed.), *A Companion to the Ancient Novel* (Leiden) 87–106
- Bowie, E. L. (1997) 'Hadrian, Favorinus and Plutarch' in Mossman, J. (ed.), *Plutarch and his Intellectual World* (London) 1–15
- Bowman, A. K. (1991) 'Literacy in the Roman empire: mass and mode', in Humphrey (1991) 119–31
- Bowman, A. K. and Woolf, G. D. (eds.) (1994) *Literacy and Power in the Ancient World*. Cambridge
- Brain, P. (1986) *Galen on Bloodletting*. Cambridge
- Brancacci, A. (1985) *Rhetorike philosophousa. Dione Crisostomo nella cultura antica e bizantina*. Rome
- Breckenridge, J. D. (1981) 'Roman imperial portraiture from Augustus to Gallienus', *ANRW* II 12.2: 477–512
- Bréhier, E. (1908) *Les idées philosophiques de Philon d'Alexandrie*. Paris
- Brendel, O. J. (1979) *Prolegomena to the Study of Roman Art*. New Haven and London
- Brenk, F. E. (1977) *In Mist Apparelled: Religious Themes in Plutarch's Moralia and Lives*. Leiden
- Brenk, F. E. (1986) 'In the light of the moon: demonology in the early imperial period', *ANRW* II 16.3: 2068–145
- Brilliant, R. (1974) *Roman Art from the Republic to Constantine*. London and New York
- Brilliant, R. (1984) *Visual Narratives: Storytelling in Etruscan and Roman Art*. London and New York
- Brisson, L. and Patillon, M. (1994) 'Longinus Platonicus philosophus et philologus', *ANRW* II 36.7: 5214–99
- Brown, F. E. (1961) *Roman Architecture*. London and New York
- Brown, J. P. (1979, 1980) 'The sacrificial cult and its critics in Greek and Hebrew', *Journal of Semitic Studies* 24: 159–74, 25: 1–21
- Bruhl, A. (1953) *Liber Pater*. Paris
- Bruneau, P. (1981) 'Tendances de la mosaïque en Grèce à l'époque impériale', *ANRW* II 12.2: 320–46
- Brunt, P. A. (1974) 'Marcus Aurelius in his *Meditations*', *JRS* 64: 1–20
- Brunt, P. A. (1976) 'The Romanization of the local ruling classes in the Roman Empire', in D. M. Pippidi (ed.), *Assimilation et résistance à la culture gréco-romaine dans le monde ancien* (Bucharest) 161–73 (= with revisions, Brunt, *Imperial Themes* ch. 12)
- Burkert, W. (1987) *Ancient Mystery Cults*. Cambridge, Mass.
- Calderini, R. (1950) 'Gli ἀγράμματοι nell'Egitto greco-romano', *Aegyptus* 30: 17–41

- Camodeca, G. (1999) *Tabulae Pompeianae Sulpiciorum, Edizione critica dell'archivio puteolano dei Sulpicii*. 2 vols. Rome
- Campbell, L. A. (1968) *Mithraic Iconography and Ideology* (EPRO 11). Leiden
- Clauss, M. (1990) *Mithras. Kult und Mysterien*. Munich
- Clauss, M. (1992) *Cultores Mithrae. Die Anhängerschaft des Mithras-Kultes*. Stuttgart
- Coarelli, F. (1979) 'Topografia mitraica di Roma (con una carta)', in U. Bianchi (ed.), *Mysteria Mithrae* (Leiden) 69–79
- Cockle, H. (1981) 'Pottery manufacture in Roman Egypt: a new papyrus', *JRS* 71: 87–97
- Cole, S. G. (1993) 'Dionysus and the dead', in T. H. Carpenter and C. A. Faraone (eds.), *Masks of Dionysus* (Ithaca and London) 276–95
- Colledge, M. A. R. (1976) *The Art of Palmyra*. London
- Colledge, M. A. R. (1977) *Parthian Art*. London
- Colpe, C. (1975) 'Geister (Demonen)', *RAC* 9: 546–797
- Colson, F. H. (1920) *The Week*. Cambridge
- Conrad, L. I., Neve, M., Nutton, V., Porter, R. and Wear, A. (1995) *The Western Medical Tradition, 800 B.C.–1800 A.D.* Cambridge
- Corbier, M. (1987) 'L'écriture dans l'espace public romain', in *L'Urbs. Espace urbain et histoire. Ier siècle av. J.C.–III siècle ap. J.C.* (Collection de l'Ecole française de Rome 98) (Rome) 27–60
- Cornell, T. and Matthews, J. (1982) *Atlas of the Roman World*. Oxford
- Cramer, F. H. (1954) *Astrology in Roman Law and Politics*. Philadelphia
- Crawford, M. H. (1988) 'The laws of the Romans: knowledge and diffusion', in *Estudios sobre la Tabula Siarensis* (Madrid) 127–40
- Crook, J. A. (1978) 'Working notes on some of the new Pompeii tablets', *ZPE* 29: 229–39
- Cumont, F. (1923) *Afterlife in Roman Paganism*. New Haven
- Cumont, F. (1942) *Recherches sur le symbolisme funéraire des romains*. Paris
- Cumont, F. (1949) *Lux perpetua*. Paris
- Cuq, E. (1896) 'Fusus', *Dar-Sag* 2: 1386–409
- Daniélou, J. (1964) *The Theology of Jewish Christianity*, trans. J. A. Baker. London
- Daniels, C. M. (1975) 'The role of the Roman army in the spread and practice of Mithraism', in *Mithraic Studies: Proceedings of the First International Congress of Mithraic Studies* (Manchester) 249–74
- Darmon, J. P. (1981) 'Les mosaïques en occident 1', *ANRW* II 12.2: 266–319
- Debord, P. (1982) *Aspects sociaux et économiques de la vie religieuse dans l'Anatolie gréco-romaine* (EPRO 88). Leiden
- Debru, A. (1994) 'L'expérimentation chez Galien', *ANRW* II 37.2: 1718–56
- Deichgräber, K. (1965) *Die griechische Empirikerschule*. 2nd edn. Berlin
- Deichgräber, K. (1971) *Aretaens von Kappadozien als medizinischer Schriftsteller*. Berlin
- Deitz, L. (1987) 'Bibliographie du platonisme impérial antérieur à Plotin', *ANRW* II 36.1: 123–82
- Desbordes, F. (1990) *Idées romaines sur l'écriture*. Lille
- Des Places, E. (1984) 'Les oracles chaldaïques', *ANRW* II 17.4: 2300–35
- Desideri, P. (1978) *Dione di Prusa: Un intellettuale greco nell'impero romano*. Messina
- Detienne, M. (ed.) (1988) *Les savoirs de l'écriture en Grèce ancienne*. Lille

- Dillon, J. M. (1977) *The Middle Platonists*. London and Ithaca
- Dillon, J. M. (1979) 'The Academy in the Middle Platonic Period', *Dionysius* 3: 63–77 (= Dillon (1991) ch. 3)
- Dillon, J. M. (1991) *The Golden Chain*. Aldershot
- Dillon, J. M. (1993) *Alcinous, The Handbook of Platonism*. Oxford
- Dillon, J. M. and Long, A. A. (eds.) (1988) *The Question of 'Eclecticism': Studies in Later Greek Philosophy*. Berkeley and Los Angeles
- Dodd, C. H. (1935) *The Bible and the Greeks*, Part II: *Hellenistic Judaism and the Hermetica* (London) 99–248
- Dodds, E. R. (1928) 'The *Parmenides* of Plato and the origin of the Neoplatonic One', *CQ* 22: 129–42
- Dodds, E. R. (1947) 'Theurgy and its relationship to Neoplatonism', *JRS* 37: 55–73
- Dodds, E. R. (1965) *Pagan and Christian in an Age of Anxiety*. Cambridge
- Domaszewski, A. von (1895) *Die Religion des römischen Heeres*. Trier
- Donini, P.-L. (1974) *Tre studi sull'aristotelismo nel II secolo d.C.* Turin
- Donini, P.-L. (1982) *Le scuole, l'anima, l'impero: la filosofia antica da Antioco a Plotino*. Turin
- Donini, P.-L. (1988) 'The history of the concept of eclecticism', in Dillon and Long (1988) 15–33
- Donini, P.-L. (1992) 'Galeno e la filosofia', *ANRW* II 36.5: 3484–504
- Dorigo, W. (1971) *Late Roman Painting: A Study of Pictorial Records 30 B.C.–A.D. 500*. London
- Dörrie, H. (1971) 'Die Stellung Plutarchs im Platonismus seiner Zeit', in R. Palmer and R. Hamerton-Kelly (eds.), *Philomathes: Studies and Essays in the Humanities in Memory of Philip Merlan* (The Hague) 36–56
- Dörrie, H. (1973) 'L. Calbenos Tauros', *Kairos* 15: 24–35 (= Dörrie (1976) 310–23)
- Dörrie, H. (1976) *Platonica minora*. Munich
- Dörrie, H. and Baltes, M. (1987–93) *Der Platonismus in der Antike*, I (1987); II (1990); III (1993). Stuttgart and Bad Cannstadt
- Drabkin, I. E. (1951) 'Soranus and his systems of medicine', *BullHistMed* 25: 503–18
- Drachman, A. B. (1922) *Atheism in Pagan Antiquity*. London
- Drijvers, H. J. W. (1976) *The Religion of Palmyra*. Leiden
- Drijvers, H. J. W. (1980) *Cults and Beliefs at Edessa*. Leiden
- Düll, S. (1975) 'Götter auf makedonischen Grabstelen', in *Essays in Memory of B. Laourdas* (Thessalonica) 115–35
- Düll, S. (1977) *Die Götterkulte Nordmakedoniens in römischer Zeit*. Munich
- Dunand, F. (1972–3) *Le culte d'Isis dans le bassin orientale de la Méditerranée* (EPRO 26). 3 vols. Leiden
- Dunand, F. and Lévêque, P. (1975) *Les syncrétismes dans les religions de l'antiquité* (EPRO 46). Leiden
- Dunbabin, K. M. D. (1978) *The Mosaics of Roman North Africa*. Oxford
- Duthoy, R. (1969) *The Taurobolium: Its Evolution and Terminology* (EPRO 10). Leiden
- Duval, P.-M. (1970) *Les dieux de la Gaule*. 2nd edn. Paris
- Ebbell, B. (1967) *Beiträge zur ältesten Geschichte einiger Infektionskrankheiten*. Oslo
- Edelstein, L. (1936) 'The philosophical system of Posidonius', *AJP* 57: 286–325

- Edelstein, L. (1967) *Ancient Medicine*. Baltimore
- Edelstein, L. and Kidd, I. G. (1972, 1988) *Posidonius, Vol. 1: The Fragments* (1972, rev. 1988); *Vol. II: The Commentary* (1988). Cambridge
- Egger, R. (1961) *Die Stadt auf dem Magdalensberg: ein Grosshandelsplatz*. Vienna
- Eichholz, D. E. (1951) 'Galen and his environment', *GR* 20: 60–71
- Eissfeldt, O. (1941) 'Tempel und Kulte syrischer Städte in hellenistisch-römischer Zeit', *Der Alte Orient* 40: 36–63
- Etienne, R. (1958) *Le culte imperial dans la péninsule ibérique d'Auguste à Diocletien*. Paris
- Evans, J. (1987) 'Graffiti and the evidence of literacy and pottery use in Roman Britain', *Archaeological Journal* 144: 191–204
- Fabricius, C. (1972) *Galens Exzerpte aus älteren Pharmakologen*. Berlin
- Fayer, C. (1976) *Il culto della Roma, origine e diffusione nell'impero*. Chieti
- Fears, J. R. (1977) *Princeps a diis electus. The Divine Election of the Emperor as a Political Concept at Rome*. Rome
- Fears, J. R. (1981) 'The cult of Jupiter and Roman imperial ideology', *ANRW* II 17.1: 3–14
- Fellmann, R. (1981) 'Der Sabazios Kult', in Vermaseren (1981) 316–40
- Ferguson, E. (1980) 'Spiritual sacrifice in early Christianity and its environment', *ANRW* II 23.2: 1151–89
- Festugière, A.-J. (1935) 'Les mystères de Dionysios', *RB* 44: 192–211, 366–96 (= Festugière (1972) 13–63)
- Festugière, A.-J. (1949–54) *La révélation d'Hermès Trismégiste*. 4 vols. Paris
- Festugière, A.-J. (1954) *Personal Religion among the Greeks*. Berkeley
- Festugière, A.-J. (1972) *Etudes de religion grecque et hellénistique*. Paris
- Fink, R. O., Hoey, A. S. and Snyder, W.-F. (1940) 'The Feriale Duranum', *YCS* 7: 1–222
- Fishwick, D. (1966) 'The cannophoroi and the March festival of *magna mater*', *TAPA* 97: 193–202
- Fishwick, D. (1987–92) *The Imperial Cult in the Latin West (EPRO 102 and 108)*. Leiden
- Fittschen, K. and Zanker, P. (1983–5) *Katalog der römischen Porträts in den Capitolinischen Museen und den anderen kommunalen Sammlungen der Stadt Rom I–IV*. Mainz
- Flambard, J. M. (1987) 'Elements pour une approche financière de la mort dans les classes populaires du Haut-Empire – analyse du budget de quelques collègues funéraires de Rome et de l'Italie', in F. Hinard (ed.), *La mort, les morts et l'au-delà dans le monde romain* (Caen) 209–44
- Fontenrose, J. (1988) *Didyma: Apollo's Oracle, Cult and Companions*. Berkeley
- Foucault, M. (1984) *Histoire de la sexualité, III. Le souci de soi*. Paris
- Fowden, G. (1986) *The Egyptian Hermes: A Historical Approach to the Late Pagan Mind*. Cambridge
- Fowden, G. (1987) 'Pagan versions of the rain miracles of A.D. 172', *Historia* 36: 83–95
- Franklin, J. L. (1991) 'Literacy and the parietal inscriptions of Pompeii', in Humphrey (1991) 77–98
- Fraser, P. M. (1960) 'Two studies on the cult of Serapis in the Hellenistic world', in *Opuscula Athenensia* III (Lund) 20–49

- Frede, M. (1981) 'On Galen's epistemology', in Nutton (1981) 65-86 (= Frede (1987a) 279-98)
- Frede, M. (1982) 'The method of the so-called Methodical school of medicine', in J. Barnes, J. Brunschwig, M. Burnyeat and M. Schofield (eds.), *Science and Speculation* (Cambridge) 1-23
- Frede, M. (1985) *Galen, Three Treatises on the Nature of Science*. Indianapolis
- Frede, M. (1987a) *Essays in Ancient Philosophy*. Minnesota
- Frede, M. (1987b) 'Numenius', *ANRW* II 36.2: 1034-75
- Friedländer, L. (1921-3) *Sittengeschichte Roms*. 4 vols. 10th edn. Leipzig
- Frischer, B. (1982) *The Sculpted Word*. Berkeley and Los Angeles
- Fuchs, R. (1903) 'Aus Themisons Werk über die acuten und chronischen Krankheiten', *RhM* 53: 67-114
- Furley, D. J. and Wilkie, J. S. (1984) *Galen on Respiration and the Arteries*. Princeton
- Gagé, J. (1981) 'La mystique impériale et l'épreuve des jeux, Commode-Hercule et l'anthropologie héarcléenne', *ANRW* II 17.2: 662-83
- Garofalo, I. (1992) 'Prolegomena all'edizione dell'Anonymus Parisinus Darembergii sive Fuchsii', in A. Garzya (ed.), *Tradizione e ecdotica dei testi medicine tardaontichi e bizantini* (Naples) 91-104
- Geffken, J. (1978) *The Last Days of Graeco-Roman Paganism*, trans. S. MacCormack. Amsterdam
- Gero, S. (1990) 'Galen on the Christians: a reappraisal of the Arabic evidence', *Orientalia Christiana Periodica* 56: 371-411
- Gilliam, J. F. (1961) 'The plague under Marcus Aurelius', *AJPh* 82: 225-51
- Girard, J.-L. (1980) 'Interpretatio romana', *RHPbR* 60: 21-7
- Girard, J.-L. (1981) 'Domitien et Minerve', *ANRW* II 17.1: 233-45
- Giusta, M. (1964) *I dossographi di etica*. Turin
- Gleason, M. (1994) *Making Men: Sophists and Self-representation in Ancient Rome*. Princeton
- Glucker, J. (1978) *Antiochus and the Late Academy*. Göttingen
- González, J. (1986) 'The Lex Irnitana: a new copy of the Flavian municipal law', *JRS* 76: 147-243
- Goodman, M. (1994) *Mission and Conversion: Proselytizing in the Religious History of the Roman Empire*. Oxford
- Goody, J. R. (ed.) (1968) *Literacy in Traditional Societies*. Cambridge
- Goody, J. R. (1977) *The Domestication of the Savage Mind*. Cambridge
- Goody, J. R. (1986) *The Logic of Writing and the Organisation of Society*. Cambridge
- Gordon, R. L. (1972) 'Mithraism and Roman society', *Religion* 2: 92-121
- Gordon, R. L. (1990a) 'The Veil of Power: emperors, sacrifices and benefactors', in Beard and North (1990) 201-31
- Gordon, R. L. (1990b) 'Religion in the Roman empire: the civic compromise and its limits', in Beard and North (1990) 233-55
- Gordon, R. L. (1994) 'Mystery, metaphor and doctrine in the mysteries of Mithras', in Hinnells (1994) 103-29
- Gottschalk, H. B. (1987) 'Aristotelian philosophy in the Roman world from the time of Cicero to the end of the second century A.D.', *ANRW* II 36.2: 1079-174
- Gourevitch, D. (1988) 'Introduction générale: I. Situation de Soranos dans la

- médecine antique', in P. Burguière, D. Gourevitch and Y. Malinas (eds.), *Soranos d'Éphèse, Maladies des Femmes* (Paris) vii-xlvi
- Graff, H. J. (1979) *The Literacy Myth: Literacy and Social Structure in the Nineteenth Century City*. New York
- Graindor, P. (1934) *Athènes sous Hadrien*. Cairo (Reissued New York, 1973)
- Grandjean, Y. (1975) *Une nouvelle arétalogie d'Isis à Maronée* (EPRO 49). Leiden
- Grant, R. L. (1960) 'Antyllus and his medical works', *BullHistMed* 34: 154-74
- Grant, R. M. (1967) 'Les êtres intermédiaires dans le judaïsme tardive', in U. Bianchi (ed.), *Le origini dello Gnosticismo* (Leiden) 141-57
- Green, M. (1976) *A Corpus of Religious Material from the Civilian Areas of Roman Britain* (BAR 24). Oxford
- Griffin, M. (1971) Review of Bowersock, *Sophists*, *JRS* 61: 278-80
- Griffin, M. (1976) *Seneca: A Philosopher in Politics*. Oxford
- Griffin, M. and Barnes, J. (eds.) (1989) *Philosophia Togata: Essays on Philosophy and Roman Society*. Oxford
- Griffiths, J. G. (1975) *Apuleius of Madauros, The Isis Book (Metamorphoses, Book XI)* (EPRO 39). Leiden
- Gundel, W. G. (1950a) 'Astroreligion', *RAC* 1: 810-17
- Gundel, W. G. (1950b) 'Astrologie', *RAC* 1: 817-31
- Haarhof, T. (1920) *The Schools of Gaul*. Oxford
- Habicht, C. (1969) *Die Inschriften des Asklepeions, Altertümer von Pergamon VIII.3*. Berlin
- Habicht, C. (1985) *Pausanias' Guide to Ancient Greece*. Berkeley and Los Angeles
- Hadot, P. (1984) 'Marc Aurèle, était-il opiomane?', in E. Lucchesi and H. D. Saffrey (eds.), *Antiquité païenne et chrétienne* (Geneva) 33-50
- Hägg, T. (1983) *The Novel in Antiquity*. Oxford
- Hajjar, V. (1977) *La Triade d'Héliopolis-Baalbek, son culte et sa diffusion à travers les textes littéraires et les documents iconographiques et épigraphiques* (EPRO 59). Leiden
- Hamilton, V. P. (1992) 'Satan', in *Anchor Bible Dictionary* v (New York) 958-89
- Hankinson, R. J. (1992) 'Galen's philosophical eclecticism', *ANRW* II 36.5: 3505-22
- Hankinson, R. J. (1994) 'Galen's anatomical procedures', *ANRW* II 37.2: 1834-55
- Hanson, A. E. (1991) 'Ancient illiteracy', in Humphrey (1991) 159-98
- Hanson, A. E. and Green, M. H. (1994) 'Methodicorum principes: Soranus of Ephesus', *ANRW* II 37.2: 1834-55
- Hanson, R. P. C. (1980) 'The Christian attitude to pagan religions up to the time of Constantine the Great', *ANRW* II 23.2: 910-73
- Hardie, A. (1983) *Statius and the 'Silvae'*. Liverpool
- Harig, G. (1974) *Bestimmung der Intensität im medizinischen System Galens*. Berlin
- Harnack, A. (1892) 'Medizinisches aus der ältesten Kirchengeschichte', *Texte und Untersuchungen zur Geschichte der Altchristlichen Literatur* 8.4: 37-152
- Harris, C. R. S. (1973) *The Heart and the Vascular System in Ancient Greek Medicine*. Oxford
- Harris, W. V. (1983) 'Literacy and epigraphy I', *ZPE* 52: 87-111
- Harrison, S. J. (2000) *Apuleius: A Latin Sophist*. Oxford
- Hatt, E. (1965) 'Essai sur l'évolution de la religion gauloise', *REA* 67: 80-125
- Hatt, J.-J. (1978) 'Divinités orientales et dieux gaulois', in Benoit, Philonenko and Vogel (1978) 277-94

- Henig, M. (1983a) *Handbook of Roman Art*. Oxford
- Henig, M. (1983b) *Religion in Roman Britain*. London
- Henrichs, A. (1968) 'Vespasian's visit to Alexandria', *ZPE* 3: 51–80
- Herz, P. (1978) 'Kaiserfeste der Prinzipatszeit', *ANRW* II 16.2: 1135–200
- Herzog, R. (1931) *Die Wunderheilungen von Epidauros. Ein Betrag zur Geschichte der Medizin und Religion*. Leipzig
- Hinnells, J. (ed.) (1994) *Studies in Mithraism*. Rome
- Hoelscher, T. (1967) *Victoria Romana. Archäologische Untersuchungen zur Geschichte und Wesensart der römischen Siegesgöttin von den Anfängen bis zum Ende des 3. Jhs. n. Chr.* Mainz
- Hopfner, T. (1921) *Offenbarungszauber*. Leipzig (reissued Amsterdam, 1974)
- Hopfner, T. (1928) 'Mageia', *RE* 14, 1: 301–93
- Hopfner, T. (1935) 'Mysterien', *RE* 16: 1209–350
- Hopkins, K. (1991) 'Conquest by book', in Humphrey (1991) 133–58
- Horne, P. C. and King, A. C. (1980) 'Romano-Celtic temples in continental Europe: a gazetteer of those with known plans', in W. Rodwell (ed.), *Temples, Churches and Religion* (BAR 77) (Oxford) 364–556
- Horsfall, N. (1989) "'The uses of literacy" and the Cena Trimalchionis', *G&R* 36: 74–89, 194–209
- Horsfall, N. (1991) 'Statistics or states of mind?' in Humphrey (1991) 59–76
- Humphrey, J. H. (ed.) (1991) *Literacy in the Roman World* (JRA Suppl. 3). Ann Arbor
- Inan, J. (1979) *Römische und frühbyzantinische Porträtplastik aus der Türkei: neu Funde*. Mainz
- Inan, J. and Rosenbaum, E. (1966) *Roman and Early Byzantine Portrait Sculpture in Asia Minor*. London
- Isnardi Parente, M. (1989) 'Ierocle Stoico, Oikeiosis e doveri sociali', *ANRW* II 36.3: 2201–26
- Jaczynowska, M. (1981) 'Le culte de l'Hercule romain au temps du haut-empire', *ANRW* II 17.2: 662–83
- Johnson, S. E. (1984) 'The present state of Sabazio's research', *ANRW* II 17.3: 1583–613
- Jones, B. and Mattingly, D. (1990) *An Atlas of Roman Britain*. Oxford
- Jones, C. P. (1966) 'The teacher of Plutarch', *HSCP* 71: 205–13
- Kahn, C. (1988) 'Discovering the will', in Dillon and Long (1988) 234–59
- Kennedy, G. (1972) *The Art of Rhetoric in the Roman World 300 B.C.–A.D. 300*. Princeton
- Kenney, E. J. (1982) 'Books and readers in the Roman world', in E. J. Kenney (ed.), *Cambridge History of Classical Literature II. Latin Literature* (Cambridge) 3–32
- Kieffer, J. S. (1964) *Galen's Institutio Logica*. Baltimore
- Kleberg, T. (1975) 'Commercio librario ed editoria nel mondo antico', in G. Cavallo (ed.), *Libri, editori e pubblico nel mondo antico* (Rome) 25–80
- Knibbe, D. (1981–2) 'Neue Inschriften aus Ephesos', *JÖAI* 53: 136–40
- Knox, B. M. W. (1968) 'Silent reading in antiquity', *GRBS* 9: 421–35
- Koch, G. and Sichtermann, H. (1982) *Römische Sarkophage*. Munich
- Koeppel, G. (1982a) 'Official state reliefs of the city of Rome in the imperial age: a bibliography', *ANRW* II 12.1: 477–506
- Koeppel, G. (1982b) 'The grand pictorial tradition of Roman historical representation during the early empire', *ANRW* II 12.1: 507–35

- Kollesch, J. and Nickel, D. (eds.) (1993) *Galen und das hellenistische Erbe*. Stuttgart
- Köves-Zulauf, T. (1972) *Reden und Schweigen. Römische Religion bei Plinius Maior*. Munich
- Köves-Zulauf, T. (1978) 'Plinius d. Ältere und die römische Religion', *ANRW* II 16.1: 187-298
- Kraabel, A. (1978) 'Paganism and Judaism: the Sardis evidence', in Benoit, Philonenko and Vogel (1978) 13-33
- Krämer, H. J. *Der Ursprung der Geistmetaphysik*. Amsterdam
- Kudlien, F. (1964) *Untersuchungen zu Aretaios von Kappadokien*. Mainz
- Kudlien, F. (1971) 'Galens Urteil über die Thukydideische Pestbeschreibung', *Episteme* 5: 132-3
- Kudlien, F. (1983) 'Schaustellerei und Heilmittelvertrieb in der Antike', *Gesnerus* 40: 91-8
- Kudlien, F. and Durling, R. J. (eds.) (1991) *Galen's Method of Healing*. Leiden
- Lahusen, G. (1983) *Untersuchungen zur Ehre statue in Rom. Literarische und epigraphische Zeugnisse* (Archeologica 35). Rome
- Lambrechts, P. (1952) 'Les fêtes phrygiennes de Cybèle et d'Attis', *BIBR* 27: 141-70
- Lambrechts, P. (1965) 'La persistance des éléments indigènes dans l'art de Gaule Belgique', in *Le rayonnement des civilisations grecques et romaines sur les cultures périphériques* (Paris) 153-63
- Lane, E. N. (1990) 'Men: a neglected cult of Roman Asia Minor', *ANRW* II 18.3: 2161-74
- Larrain, C. J. (1992) *Galens Kommentar zu Platons Timaios*. Stuttgart
- Larsen, M. T. (1988) 'Introduction: literacy and social complexity', in J. Gledhill, B. Bender and M. T. Larsen (eds.), *State and Society: The Emergence and Development of Social Hierarchy and Political Centralisation* (One World Archaeology 4) (London) 173-91
- Latte, K. (1960) *Römische Religionsgeschichte*. Munich
- Lattimore, R. (1962) *Themes in Greek and Latin Epitaphs*. Urbana
- Laumonier, A. (1958) *Les cultures indigènes en Carie*. Paris
- Lawrence, A. W. (1972) *Greek and Roman Sculpture*. London
- Leclant, J. (1984) 'Aegyptiaca et milieux isiaques. Recherches sur la diffusion du matériel et des idées égyptiennes', *ANRW* II 17.3: 1692-709
- Le Glay, M. (1966) *Saturne africain. Histoire*. Paris
- Le Glay, M. (1978) 'La *dexiosis* dans les mystères de Mithra', in J. Duchesne-Guillemin (ed.), *Etudes Mithraïques* (Acta Iranica 17) (Leiden) 279-303
- Levin, S. (1989) 'The old Greek oracles in decline', *ANRW* II 18.2: 1599-649
- Lewis, M. J. T. (1966) *Temples in Roman Britain*. Cambridge
- Lewis, N. (1974) *Papyrus in Classical Antiquity*. Oxford
- Lewy, H. (1978) *Chaldean Oracles and Theurgy, Mysticism, Magic and Platonism in the Later Roman Empire*. Paris
- Liebeschuetz, W. (1979) *Continuity and Change in Roman Religion*. Oxford
- Liebeschuetz, W. (1994) 'The expansion of Mithraism among the religious cults of the second century', in Hinnells (1994) 195-216
- Lietzmann, H. (1932-44) *Geschichte der alten Kirche*. Berlin
- Lieu, J., North, J. and Rajak, T. (eds.) (1992) *The Jews among Pagans and Christians in the Roman Empire*. London

- Lilla, S. (1971) *Clement of Alexandria: A Study in Christian Platonism*. Oxford
- Littman, R. J. and Littman, M. L. (1973) 'Galen and the Antonine plague', *AJPh* 94: 243–55
- Lloyd, G. E. R. (1973) *Greek Science after Aristotle*. London
- Lloyd, G. E. R. (1983) *Science, Folklore and Ideology*. Cambridge
- Lloyd, G. E. R. (1993) 'Galen on Hellenistics and Hippocrateans', in Kollesch and Nickel (1993) 125–44
- Loenen, J. H. (1956–7) 'Albinus' metaphysics, an attempt at rehabilitation', *Mnemosyne* ser. 4, 9: 296–319; 10: 35–56
- Lutz, C. (1947) *Musonius Rufus, the Roman Socrates*. New Haven
- Lynch, N. P. (1972) *Aristotle's School*. Berkeley and Los Angeles
- McKitterick, R. (1989) *The Carolingians and the Written Word*. Cambridge
- McKitterick, R. (ed.) (1990) *The Uses of Literacy in Early Mediaeval Europe*. Cambridge
- MacMullen, R. (1966) 'Provincial languages in the Roman empire', *AJPh* 87: 1–17 (= MacMullen (1990) ch. 4)
- MacMullen, R. (1981) *Paganism in the Roman Empire*. New Haven
- MacMullen, R. (1982) 'The epigraphic habit in the Roman empire', *AJPh* 103: 233–46
- MacMullen, R. (1984) *Christianizing the Roman Empire*. Haven
- MacMullen, R. (1990) *Changes in the Roman empire: Essays in the Ordinary*. Princeton
- Majer-Leonard, E. (1913) 'Ἀγράμματοι: in Aegyptio qui litteras sciverint qui nesciverint ex papyris graecis quantum fieri potest exploratur'. Frankfurt
- Malaise, M. (1972) *Les conditions de pénétration et de diffusion des cultes égyptiens en Italie* (*EPRO* 21). Leiden
- Malaise, M. (1981) 'Contenu et effets de l'initiation isiaque', *AC* 50: 483–98
- Malaise, M. (1984) 'La diffusion des cultes égyptiens dans les provinces européennes de l'empire romain', *ANRW* II 17.3: 1615–91
- Manetti, D. and Roselli, A. (1994) 'Galeno commentatore di Ippocrate', *ANRW* II 37.2: 1529–635
- Mansfeld, J. (1972) 'Three notes on Albinus', *Theta-Pi* 1: 61–80
- Manuli, P. (1984) 'Lo stilo del commento. Galeno e la tradizione Ippocratica', in G. Giannantoni and M. Vegetti (eds.), *La scienza ellenistica* (Naples) 379–84
- Manuli, P. and Vegetti, M. (1988) *Le opere psicologiche di Galeno*. Naples
- Marichal, R. (1988) *Les graffites de la Graufesenque*. Paris
- Mattingly, H. (1940) 'The consecration of Faustina the Elder and her daughter', *HTR* 41: 147–51
- Mattingly, H. (1960) *Roman Coins*. 2nd edn. London
- Mattingly, H. B. (1977) 'Coinage and the Roman state', *NC*, ser. 7, 137, 199–215
- Mattock, J. N. (1972) 'A translation of the Arabic epitome of Galen's book', in S. M. Stern, A. Hourani and V. Brown (eds.) *Islamic Philosophy and the Classical Tradition: Essays Presented to Richard Walzer* (Oxford) 235–60
- May, M. T. (1968) *Galen on the Usefulness of the Parts of the Body*. 2 vols. Ithaca
- Mellor, R. (1975) *Θεὰ Ῥώμη: The Workings of the Goddess Roma in the Greek World* (*Hypomnemata* 42). Göttingen
- Mellor, R. (1981) 'The goddess Roma', *ANRW* II 17.2: 950–1030
- Merkelbach, R. (1962) *Roman und Mysterien in der Antike*. Munich

- Merkelbach, R. (1984) *Mithras*. Königstein
- Merkelbach, R. (1988) *Die Hirten des Dionysios*. Stuttgart
- Merlan, P. (1960) *From Platonism to Neoplatonism*. 2nd edn. The Hague
- Merlan, P. (1963) *Metaphysics, Mysticism, Metaconsciousness*. The Hague
- Meslin, M. (1974) *La fête des kalendes de janvier dans l'empire romain. Etude d'un rituel de Nouvel An* (Collection Latomus 115). Brussels
- Meyer, E. A. (1990) 'Explaining the epigraphic habit in the Roman empire: the evidence of epitaphs', *JRS* 80: 74-96
- Michl, J. (1962) 'Engel 2 (jüdisch)', *RAC* 5: 60-97
- Mielsch, H. (1981) 'Funde und Forschungen zur Wandmalerei der Prinzipatszeit von 1945 bis 1975, mit einem Nachtrag 1980', *ANRW* II 12.2: 3-64
- Millar, F. G. B. (1968) 'Local cultures in the Roman empire: Libyan, Punic and Latin in North Africa', *JRS* 58: 126-34
- Millar, F. G. B. (1971) 'Paul of Samosata, Zenobia and Aurelian: the church, local culture and political allegiance in third-century Syria', *JRS* 61: 1-17
- Millar, F. G. B. (1982) 'Emperors, frontiers and foreign relations, 31 B.C. to A.D. 378', *Britannia* 13: 1-23
- Millar, F. G. B. (1987) 'Empire, community and culture in the Roman Near East: Greeks, Syrians, Jews and Arabs', *Journal of Jewish Studies* 38: 143-64
- Mocsy, A. (1974) *Pannonia and Upper Moesia*. London
- Mol, H. (1976) *Identity and the Sacred*. Oxford
- Moles, J. L. (1978) 'The career and conversation of Dio Chrysostom', *JHS* 98: 79-100
- Mora, M. (1990) *Prosopografia Isiaca (EPRO 113)*. Leiden
- Morau, P. (1973, 1984) *Der Aristotelismus bei den Griechen*, I (1973); II (1984). Berlin
- Moreschini, C. (1978) *Apuleio e il Platonismo*. Florence
- Moretti, L. (1986) 'Il regolamento degli Iobachi atenienti', in *L'association dionysiaque dans les sociétés anciennes* (Collection de l'Ecole française de Rome 89) (Rome) 247-59
- Mrozek, S. (1973) 'A propos de la répartition chronologique des inscriptions latines dans le Haut-Empire', *Epigraphica* 35: 113-18
- Mrozek, S. (1988) 'A propos de la répartition chronologique des inscriptions latines dans le Haut-Empire', *Epigraphica* 50: 61-4
- Mudry, P. and Pigeaud, J. (1991) *Les écoles médicales à Rome. Actes du 2ème Colloque international sur les textes médicaux latins antiques, Lausanne, Septembre 1986*
- Müller, D. (1961) *Aegypten und die griechischen Isis Aretalogien*. Berlin
- Nesselrath, H. (1990) 'Lucian's introductions', in Russell (1990a) 111-40
- Neugebauer, O. and van Hoesen, H. B. (1959) *Greek Horoscopes* (Mem. Amer. Philos. Soc. 48). Philadelphia
- Neumann, G. and Untermann, J. (eds.) (1980) *Die Sprachen im römischen Reich der Kaiserzeit*. Cologne
- Nicolet, C. (1988) *L'inventaire du monde: géographie et politique aux origines de l'Empire romain*. Paris
- Niemeyer, H. G. (1968) *Studien zur statuarischen Darstellung der römischen Kaiser* (Monumenta artis Romanae 7). Berlin
- Nilsson, M. P. (1920) 'Rosalia', *RE* 2R 1A: 111-15
- Nilsson, M. P. (1950) *Geschichte der griechischen Religion*, II *Die hellenistische und römische Zeit*. Munich

- Nilsson, M. P. (1957) *The Dionysiac Mysteries of the Hellenistic and Roman Age*. Lund
- Nock, A. D. (1928) 'Oracles théologiques', *REA* 30: 280–90 (= Nock (1972) 176–94)
- Nock, A. D. (1932) 'Cremation and burial in the Roman Empire', *HTR* 25: 321–59 (= Nock (1972) 277–307)
- Nock, A. D. (1933) *Conversion*. Oxford
- Nock, A. D. (1934) 'A vision of Mandulis Aion', *HTR* 27: 53–104 (= Nock (1972) 357–400)
- Nock, A. D. (1936) 'The milieu of Gnosticism', *Gnomon* 12: 605–12 (= Nock (1972) 444–51)
- Nock, A. D. (1944) 'Later Egyptian piety', in *Coptic Egypt: Papers Read at a Symposium* (Brooklyn) 21–9 (= Nock (1972) 566–74)
- Nock, A. D. (1952) 'The Roman army and the Roman religious year', *HTR* 45: 186–252 (= Nock (1972) 736–90)
- Nock, A. D. (1972) *Essays on Religion and the Ancient World*, ed. Z. Stewart. Oxford
- North, J. (1990) 'Diviners and divination at Rome', in Beard and North (1990) 57–71
- Nutton, V. (1969) 'A Greek doctor at Chester', *Journal of the Chester Archaeological Society* 56: 6–13
- Nutton, V. (1971) 'L. Gellius Maximus, physician and procurator', *CQ* n.s. 21: 262–72
- Nutton, V. (1978) 'The beneficial ideology', in Garnsey and Whittaker, *Imperialism* 209–21
- Nutton, V. (ed.) (1981) *Galen: Problems and Prospects*. London
- Nutton, V. (1987) 'Galen's philosophical testament: "On my own opinions"', in J. Wiesner (ed.), *Aristoteles. Werk und Wirkung* 11 (Berlin and New York) 27–51
- Nutton, V. (1988) *From Democedes to Harvey: Studies in the History of Medicine*. London
- Nutton, V. (1990) 'The patient's choice: a new treatise by Galen', *CQ* 40: 236–57
- Nutton, V. (1991) 'Style and context in the method of healing', in Kudlien and Durling (1991) 1–25
- Nutton, V. (1993) 'Galen and Egypt', in Kollesch and Nickel (eds.) (1993) 11–32
- O'Meara, J. (1959) *Porphyry, Philosophy from Oracles in Augustine*. Paris
- Oberhelman, S. M. (1994) 'On the chronology of the pneumatism of Aretaios of Cappadocia', *ANRW* II 37.2: 941–66
- Obermayer, A. (1971) *Kelten und Römer am Magdalensberg*. Vienna
- Ohlemutz, E. (1968) *Die Kulte und Heiligtümer der Götter in Pergamum*. Würzburg
- Oliver, J. H. and Maas, P. L. (1939) 'An ancient poem on the duties of the physician', *BullHistMed* 7: 315–23
- Ong, W. J. (1982) *Orality and Literacy: The Technologising of the World*. London
- Oppermann, M. (1981) 'Thrakische und danubische Reitergötter und ihre Beziehungen zu orientalischen Kulturen', in Vermaseren (1981) 510–36
- Ormos, I. (1993) 'Bericht über die Herausgabe des Buches "Über die Sektion toter Lebewesen"', in Kollesch and Nickel (1993) 165–72
- Pack, R. A. (1965) *The Greek and Latin Literary Texts from Greco-Roman Egypt*. 2nd edn. Michigan
- Paduano Faedo, L. (1981) 'I sarcofagi romani con muse', *ANRW* II 12.2: 65–155
- Parke, H. W. (1967) *Greek Oracles*. London
- Parke, H. W. (1985) *The Oracles of Apollo in Asia Minor*. London

- Parlasca, K. (1966) *Mumienporträts und verwandte Denkmäler*. Wiesbaden
- Parlasca, K. (1982) *Syrische Grabreliefs hellenistischer und römischer Zeit. Fundgruppen und Probleme* (Trierer Winckelmannsprogramm 3). Mainz
- Paton, S. (1971) 'Classical marbles: a recent bibliography', *PBSR* 39: 88-9
- Patzig, G. (1968) *Aristotle's Theory of the Syllogism*, trans. by J. Barnes. Oxford
- Percival, J. (1976) *The Roman Villa: An Historical Introduction*. London
- Perkins, A. (1959) *The Excavations at Dura-Europos: Final Report V Part 1, Parchments and Papyri*. New Haven
- Perkins, A. (1973) *The Art of Dura-Europos*. Oxford
- Perry, B. E. (1967) *The Ancient Romances: A Literary-historical Account of their Origins*. Berkeley and Los Angeles
- Pickard-Cambridge, A. (1968) *The Dramatic Festivals of Athens*. 2nd edn, rev. J. Gould and D. M. Lewis. Oxford
- Pigeaud, J. (1982) 'Pro Caelio Aureliano', *Mém. Centre Jean Palerne* 3: 104-17
- Poland, F. (1926) *Geschichte des griechischen Vereinswesens*. Leipzig
- Price S. R. F. (1986) 'Dreams: Freud to Artemidorus', *PCP* 113: 3-37
- Pugliese-Caratelli, G. (1950) *Pompeiana*. Naples
- Quispel, G. (1981) 'Gnosis', in Vermaseren (1981) 413-35
- Rajak, T. (1992) 'The Jewish community and its boundaries', in Lieu, North and Rajak (eds.) (1992) 9-28
- Raschke, M. G. (1978) 'New studies in Roman commerce with the East', *ANRW* ix.2: 604-1378
- Rawson, E. (1985) *Intellectual Life in the Late Roman Republic*. London
- Rea, J. (1977) 'A new version of P. Yale Inv. 299', *ZPE* 27: 151-6
- Reardon, B. P. (1969) 'The Greek novel', *Phoenix* 23: 55-73
- Rescher, N. (1965) *The Refutation by Alexander of Aphrodisias of Galen's Treatise on the Theory of Motion*. Islamabad
- Reynolds, J. and Tannenbaum, R. (1987) *Jews and Godfearers at Aphrodisias*. Cambridge
- Rich, A. N. M. (1954) 'The Platonic ideas as thoughts of God', *Mnemosyne* ser. 4, 7: 123-33
- Rist, J. M. (1969) *Stoic Philosophy*. Cambridge
- Robert, J. and Robert, L. (1954) *La Carie* II. Paris
- Robert, L. (1966) *Documents de l'Asie Mineure méridionale*. Paris
- Robert, L. (1970) 'Deux concours grecs à Rome', *CRAI* 6-27
- Robert, L. (1971) 'Un oracle gravé à Oinoanda', *CRAI* 597-620
- Robert, L. (1977) 'La titulature de Nicée et Nicomédie: La gloire et la haine', *HSCP* 81: 1-39
- Robert, L. (1980) *A travers l'Asie Mineure*. Paris
- Robert, L. (1981) 'Le serpent Glycon d'Abonouteichos à Athènes et Artemis d'Ephèse à Rome', *CRAI* 513-30
- Robert, L. (1983) 'Stèle funéraire d'un bacchant', *BCH* 107: 597-9
- Roberts, C. H. and Skeat, T. C. (1983) *The Birth of the Codex*. London and Oxford
- Rogers, G. M. (1991) *The Sacred Identity of Ephesos: Foundation Myths of a Roman City*. London and New York
- Rommel, H. (1923) *Die naturwissenschaftlich-paradoxographischen Exkurse bei Philostratos, Heliodoros und Achilleus Tatios*. Stuttgart

- Rosenthal, F. (1975) *The Classical Heritage in Islam*. London
- Rossi, L. (1971) *Trajan's Column and the Dacian Wars*. London
- Rouché, C. M. (1993) *Performers and Partisans at Aphrodisias in the Roman and Late Roman Periods* (JRS Monographs no. 6) London
- Roussel, P. (1927) 'Les mystères de Panamara', *BCH* 51: 123–37
- Roussel, P. (1931) 'Le miracle de Zeus Panamaros', *BCH* 55: 70–116
- Rubinstein, G. L. (1985) 'The riddle of the Methodist method: understanding a Roman medical sect', Diss. Cambridge
- Rudolph, K. (1983) *Gnosis*, trans. by R. McL. Wilson. Edinburgh
- Russell, D. A. (1973) *Plutarch*. London and New York
- Russell, D. A. (1983) *Greek Declamation*. Cambridge
- Russell, D. A. (ed.) (1990a) *Antonine Literature*. Oxford
- Russell, D. A. (1990b) 'Aristides and the prose hymn', in Russell (1990a) 199–219
- Russell, D. S. (1964) *The Method and Message of Jewish Apocalypse 200 B.C.–A.D. 100*. Philadelphia
- Russu, I. I. (1975) *Inscriptiile Daciei Romane I*. Bucharest
- Rutherford, R. B. (1989) *The Meditations of Marcus Aurelius*. Oxford
- Sandbach, F. H. (1975) *The Stoics*. London
- Sandy, G. (1997) *The Greek World of Apuleius: Apuleius and the Second Sophistic* (*Mnemosyne Suppl.* 174) Leiden
- Scarborough, J. and Nutton, V. (1982) 'The preface of Dioscorides' *Materia medica*: introduction, translation and commentary', *Transactions and Studies of the College of Physicians of Philadelphia* 4.3: 187–227
- Scheid, J. (1986) 'Le thiasse du Metropolitan Museum', in *L'association dionysiaque dans les sociétés anciennes* (Collection de l'Ecole française de Rome 89) (Rome) 275–90
- Scheid, J. (1990) *Romulus et ses frères. Le collège des frères arvaux, modèle du culte public dans la Rome des empereurs*. Rome
- Schiess, T. (1988) *Die römischen Collegia funeraticia nach den Inschriften*. Munich
- Schmidt, A. (1924) *Drogen und Drogenhandel in Altertum*. Leipzig
- Schmitz, T. (1997) *Bildung und Macht. Zur sozialen und politischen Funktion der zweiten Sophistik in der griechischen Welt der Kaiserzeit* (Zetemata 97). Munich
- Schofield, M., Burnyeat, M. and Barnes, J. (eds.) (1980) *Doubt and Dogmatism: Studies in Hellenistic Epistemology*. Oxford
- Schroeder, F. M. and Todd, R. B. (1990) *Two Greek Aristotelian Commentators on the Intellect*. Toronto
- Schwertheim, E. (1974) *Die Denkmäler orientalischer Gottheiten im römischen Deutschland mit Ausnahme der ägyptischen Gottheiten*. Leiden
- Scott, K. (1936) *The Imperial Cult under the Flavians*. Stuttgart and Berlin
- Sharples, R. W. (1983) *Alexander of Aphrodisias on Fate*. London
- Sharples, R. W. (1987) 'Alexander of Aphrodisias: Scholasticism and innovation', *ANRW* II 36.2: 1176–243
- Sidebottom, H. (1990) 'Studies in Dio Chrysostom on kingship', Diss. Oxford
- Sideras, A. (1994) 'Rufus von Ephesos und sein Werk im Rahmen der antiken Medizin', *ANRW* II 37.2: 1077–253
- Simon, M. (1948) *Vetus Israel*. Paris
- Simon, M. (1955) *Hercule et le christianisme*. Paris

- Simon, M. (1981) 'Gottesfürchtiger', *RAC* 11: 1060–70
- Smith J. Z. (1971) Review of Jan Bergman, *Ich Bin Isis, History of Religion* 11: 236–490
- Smith, J. Z. (1978) *Map is not Territory*. Leiden
- Smith, M. F. (1993) *Diogenes of Oinoanda: The Epicurean Inscription*. Naples
- Smith, M. F. (1996) *The Philosophical Inscription of Diogenes of Oinoanda*. Vienna
- Smith, W. D. (1979) *The Hippocratic Tradition*. Ithaca and London
- Smith, W. D. (1982) 'Erasistratus' dietetic medicine', *BullHistMed* 56: 398–409
- Solmsen, F. (1979) *Isis among the Greeks and Romans*. Cambridge, Mass.
- Sorabji, R. (ed.) (1990) *Aristotle Transformed: The Ancient Commentators and their Influence*. London
- Spawforth, A. J. and Walker, S. (1985, 1986) 'The world of the Panhellenion, I: Athens and Eleusis', *JRS* 75: 78–104, 'II: Three Dorian cities', *JRS* 76: 88–100
- Speidel, M. P. (1978) 'The cult of the *genii* in the Roman army and a new military deity', *ANRW* II 16.2: 1542–55
- Staden, H. von (1982) 'Hairesis and heresy: the case of the *haireseis iatrikai*', in B. F. Meyer and E. P. Sanders (eds.), *Jewish and Christian Self-definition* III (London) 76–100
- Stadter, P. A. (1980) *Arrian of Nicomedia*. Chapel Hill
- Stauffer, E. (1984) 'Antike Madonnenreligion', *ANRW* II 17.3: 1425–99
- Stemmer, K. (1978) *Untersuchungen zur Typologie, Chronologie und Ikonographie der Panzerstatuen*. Berlin
- Stern, S. M. (1983) *Medieval Arabic and Hebrew Thought*. London
- Stok, F. (1993) 'La scuola medica Empirica a Roma. Problemi storici e prospettive di ricerca', *ANRW* II 37.1: 600–45
- Stough, C. (1969) *Greek Scepticism*. Berkeley and Los Angeles
- Street, B. V. (1984) *Literacy in Theory and Practice*. Cambridge
- Strohmaier, G. (1968) 'Der Arzt in der römischen Gesellschaft. Neues aus der arabischen Galenüberlieferung', *Acta Conventus XI Eirene* (Warsaw) 69–73
- Strohmaier, G. (1970) *Galen De partium homoeomerium differentia*. Berlin
- Strohmaier, G. (1993) 'Galen's commentary on Airs, Waters and Places', in Kollesch and Nickel (1993) 157–64
- Strong, D. E. (ed.) (1976) *Roman Crafts*. London
- Strong, D. E. (1986) *Roman Art* (Pelican History of Art). 2nd edn. Harmondsworth (with notes and bibliography)
- Studi sull'arco onorario romano* (Studia Archaeologica 21). Rome
- Sussman, L. A. (1978) *The Elder Seneca (Mnemosyne Suppl. 51)*. Leiden
- Sutherland, C. H. V. (1974) *Roman Coins*. London
- Swain, S. C. R. (1989) 'Favorinus and Hadrian', *ZPE* 79: 150–8
- Swain, S. C. R. (1991) 'The reliability of Philostratus' *Lives of the Sophists*', *CLAnt* 10: 148–63
- Swain, S. C. R. (1996) *Hellenism and Empire: Language, Classicism and Power in the Greek World A.D. 50–250*. Oxford
- Tarrant, H. (1985) *Scepticism or Platonism? The Philosophy of the Fourth Academy*. Cambridge
- Tarrant, H. (1993) *Thrasyllan Platonism*. Cornell
- Tcherikover, V. A., Fuks, A. and Stern, M. (1957–64) *Corpus Papyrorum Judaicarum*. 3 vols. Cambridge, Mass.

- Temkin, O. (1956) *Soranus' Gynaecology*. Baltimore
- Temkin, O. (1973) *Galenism: Rise and Decline of a Medical Philosophy*. Ithaca and London
- Temkin, O. (1977) *The Double Face of Janus and Other Essays in the History of Medicine*. Baltimore
- Temkin, O. (1991) *Hippocrates in a World of Pagans and Christians*. Baltimore
- Theiler, W. (1930) *Die Vorbereitung des Neuplatonismus*. Berlin
- Thesleff, H. (1965) *The Pythagorean Texts of the Hellenistic Period*. Turku
- Thomas, G. (1984) 'Magna Mater and Attis', *ANRW* II 17.3: 1500–35
- Thomas, R. (1989) *Oral Tradition and Written Record in Classical Athens*. Cambridge
- Thomas, R. (1992) *Literacy and Orality in Ancient Greece*. Cambridge
- Thomssen, H. (1989) 'Die Medizin des Rufus von Ephesus', Diss. Technische Universität, Munich
- Thomssen, H. and Probst, C. (1994) 'Die Medizin des Rufus von Ephesus', *ANRW* II 37.2: 1254–92
- Tod, M. N. (1932) *Sidelights on Greek History*. Oxford
- Toledo-Pereyra, L. H. (1973) 'Galen's contribution to surgery', *JHM* 28: 357–75
- Tomlin, R. S. O. (1979) 'Graffiti on Roman bricks and tiles found in Britain', in A. McWhirr (ed.), *Roman Brick and Tile: Studies in Manufacture, Distribution and Use in the Western Empire* (BAR s68) (Oxford) 231–51
- Tomlin, R. S. O. and Walker, D. (1988) *The Temple of Sulis Minerva 2: The Finds from the Sacred Spring*. Oxford
- Tóth, E. (1980) 'Silvanus viator', *Alba Regia* 18: 91–103
- Tóth, S. (1967) 'Zur Frage des Ursprungs und des sozialen Hintergrunds des Silvan Kultes in Dazien', *Acta Classica Universitatis Scientiarum Debreceniensis* 3: 77–84
- Toutain, J. (1907–20) *Les cultes païens dans l'empire romain. Les provinces latines*. Paris
- Toynbee, J. M. C. (1934) *The Hadrianic School*. Cambridge
- Toynbee, J. M. C. (1944) *Roman Medallions*. New York
- Toynbee, J. M. C. (1962) *Art in Roman Britain*. Oxford
- Toynbee, J. M. C. (1964) *Art in Britain under the Romans*. Oxford
- Toynbee, J. M. C. (1965) *Art of the Romans*. London
- Toynbee, J. M. C. (1971) *Death and Burial in the Roman World*. London
- Toynbee, J. M. C. (1973) *Animals in Roman Life and Art*. London
- Toynbee, J. M. C. and Ward-Perkins, J. B. (1956) *The Shrine of St Peter and the Excavations*. London
- Tran Tam Tinh, V. (1964) *Essai sur le culte d'Isis à Pompéi*. Paris
- Tran Tam Tinh, V. (1971) *Le culte des divinités orientales à Herculanum*. Leiden
- Tudor, D. (1976) *Corpus monumentorum religionis equitum danuviorum* (EPRO 13). Leiden
- Tupet, A.-M. (1986) 'Rites magiques dans l'antiquité romaine', *ANRW* II 16.3: 2591–675
- Turcan, R. (1958) 'Origine et sens de l'inhumation à l'époque impériale', *REA* 9: 323–47
- Turcan, R. (1972) *Les religions d'Asie dans la vallée du Rhône* (EPRO 30). Leiden
- Turcan, R. (1978a) 'Le culte impériale au IIIe siècle', *ANRW* II 61.2: 996–1084
- Turcan, R. (1978b) *Les sarcophages romains à représentations dionysiaques*. Paris
- Turcan, R. (1981a) *Mithra et le mithriacisme, que sais-je?* Paris

- Turcan, R. (1981b) 'Le sacrifice mithraïque', in *Le sacrifice dans l'antiquité* (Entretiens Fondation Hardt 227) (Geneva) 341–80
- Turcan, R. (1983) *Numismatique romaine du culte métrouaïque* (EPRO 97). Leiden
- Turcan, R. (1984) 'Les motivations de l'intolérance chrétienne et la fin du mithraïsme au IV^e siècle ap. J.-C.', in *Proceedings of the VII Congress of the International Federation of Societies for Classical Studies* (Budapest) 209–26
- Turner, E. G. (1978) 'Writing materials for businessmen', *BASP* 15: 163–9
- Twelftree, G. H. (1993) *Jesus the Exorcist*. Tübingen
- Ullmann, M. (1972) 'Das Steinbuch des Xenokrates von Ephesos', *Med-histJourn* 7: 49–64
- Ullmann, M. (1973) 'Neues zum Steinbuch des Xenokrates', *Med-histJourn* 8: 59–76
- Ullmann, M. (1978a) *Islamic Medicine*. Edinburgh
- Ullmann, M. (1978b) *Rufus von Ephesos, Krankengeschichten*. Wiesbaden
- Ullmann, M. (1983) *Die Schrift des Rufus von Ephesos über Gelbsucht in arabischer und lateinischer Übersetzung*. Göttingen
- Ullmann, M. (1994) 'Die arabische Überlieferung der Schriften des Rufus von Ephesos', *ANRW* II 37.2: 1293–420
- Van Straten, F. T. (1981) 'Gifts for gods', in Versnel (1981a) 65–181
- Vermaseren, M. J. (1977) *Cybele and Attis, the Myth and the Cult*. London
- Vermaseren, M. J. (ed.) (1981) *Die orientalischen Religionen im Römerreich* (EPRO 93). Leiden
- Vermeule, C. C. (1968) *Roman Imperial Art in Greece and Asia Minor*. Harvard
- Versnel, H. S. (ed.) (1981a) *Faith, Hope and Worship: Aspects of Religious Mentality in the Ancient World*. Leiden
- Versnel, H. S. (1981b) 'Religious mentality in ancient prayer', in Versnel (1981a) 1–64
- Veyne, P. (1966) 'Πρωτος Πονταρχης' *BCH* 90: 149–56
- Veyne, P. (1983) "'Titulus Praelatus": offrande, solemnisation et publicité dans les ex-voto gréco-romains', *RA* 1983: 281–300
- Veyne, P. (1986) 'Injustice et pitié des dieux, leur ordres ou oracles', *Latomus* 45: 259–83
- Veyne, P. (1988) *Did the Greeks Believe in their Myths?*, trans. P. Wissing (from *Les grecs ont-ils cru à leurs mythes?* (Paris, 1983)). Chicago
- Vidman, L. (1970) *Isis und Sarapis bei den Griechen und Römern*. Berlin
- Vogliano, A. (1933) 'La grande iscrizione bacchia del Metropolitan Museum', *AJA* 37: 215–31
- Wacher, J. (1978) *Roman Britain*. London
- Wallace-Hadrill, A. (1983) *Suetonius: The Scholar and his Caesars*. London
- Walsh, P. (1970) *The Roman Novel*. Cambridge
- Waltzing, J. P. (1895–1900) *Etude historique sur les corporations professionnelles chez les romains depuis les origines jusqu'à la chute de l'empire d'occident*. Brussels
- Ward-Perkins, J. B. (1975) 'Dalmatia and the marble trade', in Z. Rapanić (ed.), *Disputationes Salonicae 1970* (Split) 38–44
- Ward-Perkins, J. B. (1981) *Roman Imperial Architecture*. London (with notes and bibliography)
- Wegner, M. (1939) *Die Herrscherbildnisse in antoninischer Zeit*. Berlin
- Wegner, M. (1956) *Das römische Herrscherbild: Hadrian*. Berlin

- Wegner, M. (1966) *Das römische Herrscherbild: Die Flavii*. Berlin
- Weinreich, O. (1909) *Antike Heilungswunder. Untersuchungen zum Wunderglauben der Griechen und Römer*. Giessen
- Weinreich, O. (1930–1) *Fabel, Aretalogie, Novelle, Beiträge zu Phaedrus, Petron, Martial und Apuleius*. Heidelberg
- Wellmann, M. (1908) *Aelius Promotus* Τατρικά φυσικά καὶ ἀντιπαθητικά (Sitzb. Preuss. Akad. Wiss. 37). Berlin
- Wesseling, B. (1988) 'The audience of the ancient novel', in H. Hofmann (ed.), *Groningen Colloquia* 1. 67–80
- Whittaker, J. (1984) *Studies in Platonism and Patristic Thought*. London
- Whittaker, J. (1990) *Alcinoos, Enseignement des doctrines de Platon*. Paris
- Wild, R. A. (1984) 'The known Isis-Sarapis sanctuaries from the Roman period', *ANRW* II 17.4: 1739–857
- Williamson, C. (1987) 'Monuments of bronze: Roman legal documents on bronze tablets', *CLAnt* 6: 160–83
- Winterbottom, M. (1975) *The Elder Seneca* 1. Cambridge, Mass.
- Wiseman, J. (1973) *Studies in the Antiquities of Stobi*. Belgrade
- Witt, R. E. (1937) *Albinus and the History of Middle Platonism*. Cambridge (Revised Amsterdam, 1971)
- Witt, R. E. (1971) *Isis in the Graeco-Roman World*. London
- Wrede, H. (1978) 'Die Ausstattung stadtrömischer Grabtempel, und der Übergang zur Körperbestattung', *MDAI(R)* 85: 411–33
- Wrede, H. (1981) *Consecratio in formam deorum: vergöttlichte Privatpersonen in der römischen Kaiserzeit*. Mainz
- Youtie, H. C. (1964) 'A reconsideration of P. Oxy. 1.40', in H. Braunert (ed.), *Studien zur Papyrologie und antiken Wirtschaftsgeschichte. Friedrich Oertel zum achtzigsten Geburtstag gewidmet* (Bonn) 20–9
- Youtie, H. C. (1971a) 'Ἀγράμματος: an aspect of Greek society in Egypt', *HSCP* 75: 161–76 (= *Scriptiunculae* II (Amsterdam, 1973), ch. 29)
- Youtie, H. C. (1971b) 'Βραδέως γράφων: between literacy and illiteracy', *GRBS* 12: 239–61 (= *Scriptiunculae* II (Amsterdam, 1973), ch. 30)
- Youtie, H. C. (1975a) 'Υπογραφεύς: the social impact of illiteracy in Graeco-Roman Egypt', *ZPE* 17: 201–21 (= *Scriptiunculae Posteriores* I (Bonn, 1981), ch. 28)
- Youtie, H. C. (1975b) 'Because they do not know letters', *ZPE* 19: 101–8 (= *Scriptiunculae Posteriores* I (Bonn, 1981), ch. 40)
- Zanker, P. (1974) *Klassizistische Statuen. Studien zur Veränderung des Kunstgeschmacks in der römischen Kaiserzeit*. Mainz
- Zanker, P. (1995) *The Mask of Socrates: The Image of the Intellectual in Antiquity*. Berkeley
- Zeller, E. (1923) *Die Philosophie der Griechen* III. 5th edn. Leipzig
- Ziebarth, E. (1896) *Das griechische Vereinswesen*. Leipzig